Class 232.3 Q Book P96
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK C. 1

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF S. PAUL'S

AND THE

REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

LIBRARIAN OF THE PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD

THE ATONEMENT

BY THE REV.

LEIGHTON PULLAN

Fellow of S. John Baptist's College, Oxford
Lecturer in Theology at S. John's
and Oriel Colleges

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 Paternoster Row: London
New York, and Bombay
1906

All rights reserved

232.3 Q
P96 v.1
41795

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
YAHGELI
NEW YORK

EDITORS' PREFACE

THE object of the Oxford Library of Practical Theology is to supply some carefully considered teaching on matters of Religion to that large body of devout laymen, who desire instruction, but are not attracted by the learned treatises which appeal to the theologian. One of the needs of the time would seem to be, to translate the solid theological learning, of which there is no lack, into the vernacular of everyday practical religion; and while steering a course between what is called plain teaching on the one hand and erudition on the other, to supply some sound and readable instruction to those who require it, on the subjects included under the common title 'The Christian Religion,' that they may be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear.

The Editors, while not holding themselves precluded from suggesting criticisms, have regarded their proper task as that of editing, and accordingly they have not interfered with the responsibility of each writer for his treatment of his own subject.

W. C. E. N.
D. S.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	SIN	1
II.	JESUS CHRIST	29
III.	ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	61
IV.	THE ATONEMENT IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	92
V.	THE ATONEMENT IN THE WRITINGS OF S. JOHN	123
VI.	PRIMITIVE JEWISH CHRISTIAN TEACHING	157
VII.	THE ATONEMENT AS TAUGHT BY S. PAUL	183
VIII.	THE ATONEMENT IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS	222
	SUMMARY	252
	APPENDIX: THE WORD 'KIPPER'	255
	INDEX	259

CHAPTER I

SIN

§ 1. *The Existence of Sin.*

Atonement is reconciliation between God and man after previous estrangement, an estrangement caused by sin. And unless a man is wholly persuaded that there is nothing sacred and nothing shameful, and that such words need no longer be employed even as bogeys to frighten children, the problem of sin will appear to him to be a problem worth considering. It is not a Gothic shadow cast over the world by a designing Christian priesthood, nor a fiction invented by Semitic savages who felt that their worship was improved in quality when they gashed their breasts with knives. Sin is spoken of by Seneca as well as S. Paul, Ovid as well as Milton, Cicero as well as S. Augustine. The early Buddhists, who were very far from being fanatics, knew something about sin when they spoke of the 'three fires' of lust, ill-will, and stupidity, the 'obstacles' which hinder man's entrance into the haven of calm. Plato knew that a strong overmastering passion, gaining strength with years, will sometimes grasp the reins which should be held by illuminated reason, and drive desperately, like Phaethon, down the steep of heaven into some abyss of sensuality or crime until the soul is flung to the earth in the paralysis of death. If the idea that there is such a thing as sin be an illusion,

it is at least an illusion which is so widespread that it demands a scientific explanation and a scientific remedy. It ought not to be ignored.

It is the refusal to recognise the existence of sin in a courageous manner which is at the root of that melancholy dissatisfaction with life, that disgust with self and with the world which was known both in Roman and in medieval literature, but has found a fuller expression in the more flagrant types of modern Pessimism. There has been no more ghastly failure than the resolve to attain happiness by assuming that there is no such thing as moral evil. The modern pagan character starts with the belief that the Cross is foolishness, as the ancient Greek was apt to think. But it goes beyond the ancient Greek by preaching a 'rehabilitation of the flesh,' which means getting as much sensual pleasure as possible in life, by holding that nature when beautiful and healthy requires no law, and by accusing Christ of the supreme felony of introducing melancholy into the world. It would be both profitable and interesting to show how much melancholy, mystical or morbid, can be discovered in pagan literature, both European and Oriental, and also to show how the New Testament and other early Christian books are really brimming over with a new sense of joy. If ever a new light came to wistful eyes, it came to those who saw the dawn of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus Christ. But the irony of modern unbelief is that by denying the existence of sin it has blinded itself to the existence of goodness, and has turned its own vaunted sweetness into a cup of gall. And the drinking of that cup means intellectual and moral suicide. A typical but by no means extreme instance is afforded by the writings of Renan, whose intellectual grasp lost touch with reality in exact proportion as it relaxed its moral earnestness. Life is not true life, nature is not true nature, realism

is not true realism, when seen by a man or woman who knows nothing, and wishes to know nothing, of the power of truth and trust and self-sacrifice, and of the spiritual element in love. Let the Christian grant quite frankly that the spiritual sky is sometimes cold and grey, and that it is not a perpetual blue. When the Christian says this, his words correspond with reality, they are true to nature. But it is not true to nature to say that the good man is a fool-errant who is always cheated in the bargain of life, and it is still less true to nature to represent the whole world as a vast city of the plain in which not one righteous man is left. We ought to say this boldly, for the result of preaching freedom from moral laws is a morbid pessimism. Atheism has promised expansion and enjoyment, and has then taught us that man is a slave to instincts and passions which soon lose all charm and lead to misery; it has urged us to live our own life and to take all that we wish, and has then taught us to welcome the thought of suicide and Nirvana. To lure a man from under his grey Christian sky and his hope of waking up after God's likeness, and then to show him that the whole world is putrid and that the shortness of life is 'its best attribute,' and that annihilation is his consolation, is a very sorry joke. The new pagan tidings of great joy has turned out to be that man is merely an unhappy beast.

But if we bring an accusation against a non-Christian, we must not forget that the Christian has sometimes been to blame for the excesses of the non-Christian. It is not necessary to describe the hardness and uncharitableness of religious people whose temptations lie mainly in certain particular directions, and who find it very difficult to feel any sympathy for those who are ordinarily tempted to sin in other ways. But justice requires us to notice that the extent and range of sin have been exaggerated in some particulars by Christian

teachers of great importance. We can illustrate this from two very different sources, both of which have been deplorably fertile. The Presbyterian Westminster Confession of A.D. 1647, one of the most complete statements of Calvinism, and a document which exercised a very strong influence over the Christianity of Great Britain, says thus: 'Our first parents . . . became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body . . . we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil.' It is hard for us at the present day to understand how good and serious men could have believed a statement so obviously untrue, or persuaded themselves that it was their duty to accept a doctrine with so little scriptural support. But it is not at all hard for us to see that to teach the people who were reckoned as unconverted that they were wholly inclined to all evil, would inevitably have the effect of making them regard their sins as not much more sinful than their virtues. If we turn our attention to the Middle Ages, we can find that in Western Europe Catholicism presents us with phenomena which are not dissimilar. Certain theological opinions which were then current in connexion with marriage, and the prohibition of the marriage of the clergy, did cast something of the slur of sin upon an institution which the teaching of Jesus Christ had conspicuously hallowed and elevated. The mischief cannot be dissociated from some unfortunate language used by S. Jerome and S. Augustine at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. These two men, to whom Christendom owes a heavy debt of gratitude, did not speak of marriage in language which was always in tune with the New Testament or with the mind which the Church had expressed at the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325, or the Council of Gangra in 343. The reason is not hard to find. The youth of S. Augustine, spent by him

as a pagan in the moral mire of Carthage, and S. Jerome's early familiarity with the enervated refinement of Rome, were followed by a one-sided reaction, and the prodigious influence which might have been exercised in upholding Christ's standard of purity sometimes lent itself to the discrediting of what was really sacred. The discrediting became an accomplished fact, and life was not made more wholesome when the splendid energies of S. Wilfrid were busied in detaching an English queen from her husband in order that she might enter a nunnery, and when the laws enforcing clerical celibacy were at last obeyed in the letter but flouted in the spirit. And with regard to all the commandments of God, we may reasonably think that to see sin where God does not see it, will cause us to overlook what He intends us to hate.

Let us, then, assume that there is such a thing as sin. At present we need not define it more minutely than by describing it as whatever hinders the realisation of the perfection of humanity.

Sin is practically the same thing in all humanity. 'Sin actual is of a piece with sin historical, with sin original.' Our sins are only new specimens or new developments of sins woven into the history of the human race. Is sin, then, natural? It is only natural in the strictly limited sense that evil does not exist only in the sinful act, but attaches to a character which is sinful. A man's moral sense may be inherently torpid, so that he does wrong without precisely intending to do wrong. His action is nevertheless a sin, though it is a sin which in him may be considered natural. He is not innocent but profoundly degraded. And in the same way we can pronounce sin to be natural in humanity just so far as mankind is corrupted. But it is extremely important to balance this melancholy fact with another. When we realise the vast developments of sin, it seems to us to be like a

great stream always growing stronger, breaking down its banks and threatening to destroy everything near it. At first sight it looks as if every generation found it harder to be good. That is not true. The grace of God and the moral freedom of man really find a new sphere in every human soul, and every soul can be the means of spreading a regenerating power in the world. We are not reduced to that fatal acquiescence in the growth of evil which treats sin as something that 'can't be helped.' Sin is not in the proper sense of the word 'natural.' The struggle of the Church against Manichaeism was the instinctive assertion of the Christian mind that sin is an alien which ought never to be naturalised. As S. Augustine said, *Nulla natura malum, sed quod contra naturam, id erit malum.* There is something pathetic in the excuses which men make for their sins, even if the excuses are not quite true. They attribute their sin to some bad influence or bad company, some inrush of unexpected temptation, some inherited tendency, some forgetfulness. What they hesitate to say, what they even refuse to allow, is that the sin represented their real self. Unless he is abnormally depraved, a man will try to persuade us that he is a good fellow at heart, and that we must not judge him merely by his sins. Sin is somehow a poison, and he has not become quite inured to it. And Christianity tells him that in spite of his subterfuges he is right. No one was intended by God to be drunken or unclean or conceited or Pharisaic. Sin is unnatural, and it is not coeval with good. It may seem to be ingrained in human nature, but it was never necessary for the development of the human race. It was necessary for his development that man should be conscious of the tension and discord between lower and higher impulses. This tension and struggle are the conditions of human growth. But this tension or temptation is not sin. Experience justifies the Christian doctrine

that sin is not nature but the subversion of nature. And therefore sin ought not to be ignored on the plea that it is 'natural.'

§ 2. *False Remedies for Sin.*

The habit of ignoring sin results among well-educated modern men in one of three types of character, though there are many gradations between the more strongly marked extremes. The first type is apt to think that human character can be sufficiently developed by art, and that it is enough to be familiar with what is beautiful. The second thinks that it can be sufficiently developed by action, and that it is enough to be up and doing. The third trusts to intellectual knowledge without belief in a personal God. Let us consider these types more closely.

That there is a real and very close connexion between goodness and beauty is undeniable. They are alike in their incomprehensible character, for we cannot fully explain and define what we mean by goodness or what we mean by beauty. It is also true that beautiful surroundings give beauty and enrichment to the mind that feeds upon them. It is difficult to cherish petty thoughts when we are viewing a splendid landscape, and the fine arts make us so familiar with many sides of life that they prepare us for the vicissitudes of experience. All this, and much more than this, is true. The fact remains that, in order to employ art in the best way, in order to take advantage of the teaching of beauty, a considerable degree of moral development is required beforehand. Otherwise an æsthetic training is apt to prove the ruin of morality. We may go further and say quite positively that it ruins a true sense of beauty by encouraging a love of unreality.

The above assertion can be illustrated without diffi-

culty. If we select and study certain great and typical artistic or poetic temperaments we can detect a fatal want of unity in their character, showing that a sense of beauty and a love of art are not an adequate discipline for the moral life. They are not even a protection against the shabbiest sensualities. The best type of the one-sided artistic temperament is that of the writer who is not vicious, but treats his heroes like mere blendings of different moods and changes, and who lends himself to many different forms of life without giving himself to any. He comes to regard his own character as a work of art, and though the character may please others, it cannot inspire them with any adequate motive for action. As a man he is what Browning made his 'Last Duchess' as a wife:—

> 'She had
> A heart . . . how shall I say? . . . too soon made glad,
> Too easily impressed; she liked whate'er
> She looked on, and her looks went everywhere.
> Sir, 'twas all one! My favour at her breast,
> The dropping of the daylight in the West,
> The bough of cherries some officious fool
> Broke in the orchard for her, the white mule
> She rode with round the terrace—all and each
> Would draw from her alike the approving speech,
> Or blush, at least.'

Such characters exist in both sexes. In them the man or woman is less than the artist, and that is their condemnation.

The lowest stage which the artistic temperament can reach is that of becoming a mere connoisseur in impressions, the character of those who find a certain relish in their sins because by sin they have made themselves a more interesting study to themselves or others. They are not reluctant to utter maudlin laments over their degraded helplessness; they enjoy their pessimism because they will not make an effort. They illuminate

their very ugly souls with fairy lamps and like to act the part of showman. In other cases hypocrisy takes another form. The poet who talks of a God in whom he does not believe, who confesses to the world the sins of which he does not repent, and sings of a love which he knows to be a fancy, is a hypocrite who dissects his own hypocrisies. He is not content with analysing himself, he analyses what he might have been, and likes to deceive others about himself. Essential unreality is the mark of all these more degraded types of the worshippers of a beauty which they have failed to understand. For beauty is not really understood unless it is seen to include an element of reserve and austerity, and evokes a sense of self-control and renunciation. The dying exclamation of Nero, *Qualis artifex pereo*, was an almost prophetic epitaph for every artist and poet who is too self-conscious and too vicious to attain to the art which does not die.

Another type of the artistic character is a character which at first appears to be an echo of the antique, and then is seen to be its parody. It is very hard for us to believe that in any age the best pagan minds so deliberately avoided pain, so arrogantly demanded admiration, so resolutely surrendered to selfishness as the modern man who has exerted himself to be Greek by striving to be other than Christian. An unclean life is not rendered dignified by the conduct of a man who, in spite of his sins, is convinced of his own divinity, and a heartless disregard of others is not rendered more excusable when combined with a grave preaching of duty towards self. The modern pseudo-Hellene, little as he sometimes thinks it, is not unlike the lower type of medieval monk. He is so bent on cultivating his own peculiar powers to the full that he forgets his duty towards his neighbour, and considers that it is love's labour lost to raise the many to a

slightly higher level, or to lift one soul from off the dunghill. For everything that is really worth keeping in ancient paganism Christianity can find room, without sacrificing one jot or tittle of Christian principles, and there is no type of modern mind, artistic or moralist, which is not the better for Christianity. The anxious repudiation of Christianity and of the Christian view of sin usually means not freedom, but servitude to physical and intellectual concupiscence. In its own way the paganised form of the Italian Renaissance was more successful than any future renaissance is likely to be. But the general drift of it was towards bondage in art, morality, and politics, and Christ comes to free men from the pedantry, lust, and despotism of pseudo-Hellenism as much as from the bondage of pseudo-Christianity. In the midst of the servitude of the Renaissance stands a man both great and free and a supreme artist—Michelangelo. Whatever his faults were, his was a severe, laborious, Christian life; and it was he who fitly set above the altar of the Sistine chapel the great fresco of the Last Judgment and the warning figure of Jesus Christ—*Justus Judex ultionis.*

The second type of human character which ignores the reality of sin is that which supposes that the character of man is adequately developed by useful activity. It discovers a gospel in the word 'work,' and it finds a crown of life in the word 'efficient.' Character is to be moulded in the stream of the world, even when the stream is not very pure; and any sorrow for the defilement which it contracts is despised as only a girlish weakness suitable for a convent school. It is assumed that every normal human constitution is sufficiently healthy for it to be able to overcome the microbes of moral evil so long as exercise is not neglected. To be 'up and doing' is the secret of salvation.

This theory of life asserts a truth in asserting the dignity of work, but considered as a whole it is by no means true to experience. It contains no good point which is not stated better in the New Testament than anywhere else. That a man shall be judged according to his works is a principle which is stated with the utmost force by the apostle who preached the doctrine of justification by faith, no one knowing better than S. Paul that faith and works are 'bells of full accord.' Another excellence of this non-Christian theory is that it maintains the essential Christian principle that goodness does not consist in avoiding sin, or in existing inside a little world of our own into which the smallest possible number of temptations can enter. We shall see how extraordinarily severe our Lord was towards the man who shrinks from action and whose loins are not always girded for work. With divine patience He helped men to find out what was good in themselves, and for what work they were good. Like the men whose theory we have just noticed, He assumed that we are all free to act, and to act usefully. Sin has no meaning unless man is free. The freedom of the will must be assumed as real if sin is real and if man is responsible for sin. And this freedom is witnessed to by the human conscience. As long as a man is not an idiot or is not out of his mind, or has not wholly lost moral control by making evil his good, he is free. His freedom belongs to him as having a spirit. There have been certain periods of Church history when writers and preachers have accentuated the part of God's grace, His undeserved loving-kindness in saving man. They have been led to do this out of reverence for the sovereignty of God, or from a keen sense of the fact that God has given them personally, and therefore presumably to other Christians, more help than they deserved. God has striven with them so persuasively, so convincingly, that

they have attributed their conversion all to God and none of it to themselves. This was specially true in the case of S. Augustine. And there are passages in the New Testament which, if isolated from the arguments or the histories of which they form a part, can easily be interpreted as ignoring the freedom of the human will. If isolated they teach that man is only clay in the potter's hand. But the whole Gospel is really an appeal to a liberty which, though limited by sin, continues to exist. Any theological system which denies the freedom of the will really denies the possibility of salvation. It makes salvation magical and not moral. And it encourages on the one hand despair and on the other hand spiritual pride, two sins which the Gospel is specially fitted to destroy.

Man, therefore, is free to act, and he ought to act. But to imagine that activity, whether external or intellectual, is a dispensation from the need of repentance, is really a form of self-worship, and it is also apt to be a form of cowardice. For if a man be wholly and completely convinced that there is no God and no life beyond this life, if he is never conscious of

> 'A yearning for some hidden soul of things,
> Some outward touch complete on inner springs
> That vaguely moving bred a lonely pain,'

then he may possibly never feel a sense of guilt. And if he never feels that sense of guilt, if neither grief nor sin nor death ever shake the security of his unbelief, then he cannot be accused of the cowardice of turning his back upon reflections which he does not know. But if a man has any conception of the spiritual world, or has any understanding of the meaning of remorse or of the moral value of suffering, he will probably try to understand what sin is. If he does not try to do so, he will be haunted. He will endeavour to put aside the vision of a past from which

he has not gathered the best fruit, and the vision of an eternity which seems cold and desolate. And the character of such a man is fatally deficient. In spite of all his activity and even his usefulness, he brings to himself and others alleviations rather than remedies for the diseases of the soul. He does not really know himself, because he shuts his eyes when he reaches the solemn pauses in life at which the secrets of his own character begin to unveil themselves.

If we inquire further, and ask why the character of even the intellectual man who ignores God is deficient, we shall see that in ignoring God he has ignored some attainable height of goodness, a height quite compatible with good sense and sobriety. He possesses a faculty for the infinite, and this faculty has been underfed, or fed on unwholesome food. For man is not like the animal who is preserved by instinct from unnatural excess. Man seems compelled to worship something. By steady attention to higher obligations which run counter to natural impulses, by choosing to obey the dictates of the spirit, by attending to the claims of others instead of attending exclusively to self, a man can be drawn both to a sense of sin and to communion with God. He ceases to be content with the satisfaction either of bodily needs or of any intellectual and social interests which cannot be hallowed by a worship of God 'in spirit and in truth.' The exercise of his will, reason, and love, draw him not only outward but also upward,

> 'From the gift looking to the Giver,
> And from the cistern to the River,
> And from the finite to the Infinite,
> And from man's dust to God's divinity.'

On the other hand, if he stunts the life of sympathy and the power of his own spirit, he will lose the knowledge of God, and will either fall into a profound

inertia, or worship self with a hideous avidity. Insanity is frequently caused by unchecked devotion to self and imagined self-interests. And in countless cases men pursue lust, avarice, or ambition with a prodigal devotion which seems to be nothing else than a perverted craving for the infinite. Their god is 'the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life,' which S. John says are 'of the world.' And worship of the world and worship of self are essentially the same thing. Both usually begin with a response to some external attraction, and both end in a cold egoism in which the heart resembles an extinct volcano. They may imply the yielding of self or the assertion of self. But in either case they are degrading, for the only right self-surrender and self-assertion must be primarily towards God.

Sin, therefore, is more than imperfection or shortcoming, or the mere survival of uncivilised instincts. It is the wilful avoidance of relative perfection, the selfish misuse of faculties which ought to be applied to the most unselfish ends. It is not removed by any activity which is not based upon communion with the mind of God, because the existence of God is implied in the struggle for perfection. That mind has been made known to men 'in many portions and in many manners,' and we can now fitly turn to consider some ways in which the Bible has shown to men the mind of God with regard to sin.

First, let us attend to the story of the Fall.

§ 3. *The Story of the Fall.*

Of recent years it has been too common either to criticise the Biblical account of the Creation and the Fall as a crude and barbaric mythology, or to defend it as a piece of 'scientific' literal history. But the

narrative sails on a different sea, one of unique freshness and freedom. The polished literary style, the admirable art with which moral and religious truth are conveyed pictorially and symbolically by means of objects long familiar in popular tradition, the delicate reverence and insight displayed in the description of the relations between Adam and Eve and their common shame, form a great 'mystery-play.' The childlike simplicity of the story makes it intelligible to very simple minds, and at the same time the best cultivated intellect cannot fail to hear in it the voice of God. The derivation of the story of the Fall from a Babylonian source is still unproved, the clearest counterpart to the Hebrew story being in the Zend religion and not in the Babylonian. But from whatever source the material elements of the story were derived, those elements are filled with a religious content befitting a purely Monotheistic religion. Putting aside all attempt to discover in the story of the Fall anything which is not really in that story, we can describe it as an account of the origin of sin and of the consequent woes of mankind, those woes including increased physical suffering and a mysterious limitation of life.

Man on his material side was created by God out of the dust, or it may perhaps be translated, the 'clods' of the earth. Man's pre-eminence over the animal creation consists in the fact that God 'breathed' into him the breath of life. This expression is not used of the other animals, and it suggests that man is in a specially close relation with God and possesses higher faculties than those animals. In another passage the same teaching is conveyed by the verse which says that 'God created man in his own image.' It is now granted by scholars that this does not mean man's material nature; it refers to his immaterial nature and involves man's possession of a moral sense. It is, as we find in other passages, transmitted to the descen-

dants of Adam and belongs to man in general. Hebrew religion derives all human thought and will from God; as long as the divine breath remains outside man, it is called 'spirit,' but as given to man it is called both 'spirit' and 'soul.'

Man having received from the Divine Spirit the power of free will and of communion with God, is instructed to develop and to guard Eden, the place of full communion with God. A simple command is laid upon him, a command bidding him to *avoid* something, the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. With great psychological power the successful temptation of man by the serpent is depicted. The serpent begins by securing the aid of the woman, the weaker vessel, and then through her secures the fall of the man. In a moment they pass from innocence to a knowledge which involves some surrender to a lower impulse; their conscience smites them and they hide themselves. And when God presses for a full confession, the man, who at first hesitates, owns his deed, but tries to extenuate it by casting blame on the woman and indirectly on God Himself.

The command relates to the avoidance of something, and it is from the knowledge of limitation that moral progress seems to begin. The first stage of moral consciousness seems to be an instinctive feeling that something must not be done. And it cannot be fairly urged against the narrative that *sin* was necessary for man's intellectual development. *Temptation* is essential for the development of human nature, and it is the essential accompaniment of knowledge, but *yielding* to temptation is not; and the man who has successfully battled with evil, rises both in the moral and in the intellectual scale more surely than the man who has consciously yielded to what he knows to be a forbidden attraction. A reader of the story may naturally ask, 'How did the writer conceive knowledge to be attain-

able apart from eating, in other words, apart from sinning?' This is a question which cannot be answered with complete confidence. Probably he supposed that a life of duty passed in communion with God would gradually but certainly have led man to wisdom, the wisdom of distinguishing good from its alternative, and of renouncing in favour of a higher degree of perfection the lower degree to which it would be a sin to return. But he is content to point out the result of that knowledge which is gained by guilty pleasure.

The story of the Fall contains a difficulty of a somewhat different nature in its teaching about the connexion between sin and death. The story nowhere assumes, as later poets and theologians imagined, that man was created immortal or perfect. On the contrary, *Genesis* iii. 22 shows that man had not reached immortality before his sin, and that after his sin he cannot 'take of the tree of life.' 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' was the warning given to Adam before he ate of the other mystical tree. And yet Adam and Eve are not represented as physically dying on the day when they did eat, and the serpent was in a literal sense correct when it said, 'Ye shall not surely die.' The death which was threatened was therefore to be understood in a less obvious sense than merely physical death. The author seems to imply that if man had remained sinless he might have lived for ever physically as well as spiritually, though this is not expressed with enough fulness to be quite clear. But the death which man does incur immediately as the result of sin is the death of being driven forth from God's presence; it is a state which is conscious of the Cherubim and the flame of a sword at the entrance of the earthly paradise, and it is outwardly symbolised by the thorns and thistles which attend man's labour, and by a woman's pain in childbirth.

If we go further and ask what connexion the author supposes to exist between physical and spiritual death, we must necessarily have recourse to other passages in the Old Testament. The earlier Hebrew conception of death was that man ceases to *live* after death, though in some dim fashion he exists or vegetates. He leads a shadowy life, so shadowy and unreal that there is no link between him and the people who are in God's covenant. He is a phantom without knowledge and wisdom, he cannot give God thanks and praise, and what is sadder, God no longer remembers him or works wonders for him. When physical death comes, there comes spiritual death. Can we reverse this, and say that when spiritual death comes, then physical death comes? The Old Testament does not give a direct answer. But it does teach that by losing fellowship with God man began the process of falling into a condition which is *not-life* and semi-extinction, and that this process reaches a further stage, or finds its completion, at physical death. This is the core of the narrative with regard to the punishment of sin, and it remains logically unaffected by the question as to whether man by sin lost the opportunity of attaining physical immortality. In the Old Testament we also find the conviction that through the process of generation moral weakness, and an inclination to sin, passes on from parents to their children. This inherited sinful disposition is bound up with our human nature, and allusions to it are usually introduced as furnishing a motive for the forgiveness of our sins by God. He does not apply the strictest standard of judgment because 'the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth' (*Genesis* viii. 21). So the Psalmist says, 'In sin did my mother conceive me' (li. 5), and in more than one passage in *Job* man is regarded as inheriting moral and physical weakness from his mother (xiv. 1). The human race is recognised as not in that healthy state

which God intended, and its depravity is sometimes traced to the Fall. Thus in *Sirach* xl. 1 it is said, 'Great travail is created for every man, and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam,' and the later 2 *Esdras* vii. 48 says, 'O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, the evil is not fallen upon thee alone, but upon all of us that come of thee.' The guilt of Adam is not imputed to his posterity; guilt is only incurred when it is voluntarily embraced, and when we thereby repeat Adam's disobedience in our own persons (2 *Esdras* iii. 26). But the tendency to sin within us is something ingrained and inherited, and it cannot be dissociated from a thwarting of the purpose of God in the past.

No conceivable discovery of natural science could invalidate the moral and theological truths which are implied in the story of the Fall, the unity and personality of the Divine Creator, the kinship between man and God, the freedom of the human will, the nature of temptation, the shame of falling, the loss of God's presence, the increased pain which sin has caused for man and woman, the process of dying which is involved in alienation from God, the transmission of a taint of sin to every man that is born into the world. These truths find their echo in the human conscience, and of two of them it may be well to speak more particularly. First, that sin issues in death, and secondly that sin is done against God. Moral death is not an arbitrary penalty for being sick of a mortal moral sickness. God is Life, and sin is an alienation from God. The culmination of a life of sin, 'sin when it is full grown,' as S. James calls it, is total separation from God. The last condemnation which the Bible contains is 'He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still' (*Revelation* xxii. 11). That is all. The punishment of sin is sin; its corrosion, by a self-acting law, means that truth and

love, joy and beauty, courage and honour, become unmeaning to the corrupted and cancered character. This is to be in a dying state, it is the moral counterpart of those terrible diseases in which parts of the human body become rotten with a deadness which spreads until life is finally extinct. However true it may be that repentance and recovery are possible, the infection of sin is deadly, and one deliberate taste of evil of any kind may be quite enough to alter the whole attitude of a man or woman towards God. The false idea that God grudges us a reasonable enjoyment, or the clutching of an enjoyment which He forbids, or the wilful subordination of the good of another to our own advantage, poisons the character. And this poison does its work more effectively than the cup of Circe. More slow but not less real is the result of sins of omission. To leave undone what we might have done and were meant to do, and what we ourselves knew to be right and vaguely intended to do, may deaden the character quite as truly as any sins of commission. It is sometimes more dangerous because less noticed. Just as a clear recognition of an ideal of duty draws men to God, so the neglect of an ideal draws them away from Him. In the twenty-fifth chapter of S. Matthew, when our Lord describes certain typical cases deserving of His condemnation, not one single overt act is laid to the charge of the persons condemned. The virgins who bought no oil; the man who buried his talent; those who did not visit the hungry and the imprisoned, have made their own hell. They have debased themselves and have debased the moral currency of the world by showing no light, by pretending that it is safer to avoid the risks of trying to add to the sum of human goodness, and by withholding the acts of kindness which are thought so commonplace, and are, in God's eyes, so essentially beautiful. The habit of shirking disagreeable obvious duties is a defacement

of the inward image of God as surely suicidal as the greedier forms of sin.

And secondly, the story of the Fall proclaims what the prophets proclaimed, and Jesus Christ emphasised, that sin is not merely a selfish misuse of our powers, it is directed against God. Sin, in the strict sense of the word, is an act of hostility towards God. And the extraordinary severity with which lukewarmness is condemned in the Book of Revelation is accounted for by the fact that consistent lukewarmness in the service of God insults God, because, while it does not ignore Him, it consistently puts God in the second place. And this hostility towards God is essentially the same as the transgression of a known moral law. Those who would like to be neither for God nor for His enemies, but only for themselves, are really the enemies of God, and their indolence and levity with regard to the issues involved in religion are strictly of the nature of sin. They have, not altogether unconsciously, singled out God as their enemy. The sinner when sinning would, if he could, annihilate God. This is really implied in the ancient Hebrew teaching that God breathed into man the breath of life and made man in His own image, just as it is implied in the Greek teaching quoted by S. Paul that in God 'we live and move and have our being.' In violating God's laws we violate the laws of our nature—laws which hold the body and the soul together, and which make the body a means towards the life of the soul. But in sinning we not only destroy ourselves, but oppose God. His moral law is the expression of His own moral nature. And our conception of sin must correspond with our conception of God. If God were nothing more than a force immanent in our constitution, and not personal and self-conscious, the intellect would be under a very strong temptation to calculate how much sin might be committed with comparative

impunity. But if God be of such a nature that we can best describe Him by the name of 'Our Father'; if He can guide and hear and welcome and forgive; if, in a word, it be true that 'God is love,' then this spirit of calculation is absolutely excluded. And just in proportion as a man realises the relation of sin to himself, is he likely to realise the relation of sin to God, and even to find a stern consolation in God's consciousness of his wrongdoing. The cry, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee,' is the cry of a man who is not merely dissatisfied with a circle of outward facts which have made sin easy, nor with single actions of his own, but with himself. The offender is aware that his self is bad, he has been conscious of a higher and a lower will within him, the lower has gained the upper hand and has become a dark haunting presence with which he is perpetually confronted. In this confinement he cannot really rest, and out of it he cannot emerge until he knows that he has sinned against some Being stronger than himself. He has done more than violate his own nature and needs more than a prudent discipline. His life has been more than irrational and destructive of social life. It has been the repudiation of his divine Father, and he needs that Father's forgiveness. And at this point Christianity meets the awakened conscience as no other ethical or religious system has ever done. In the first place, it does not insult the sinner's dissatisfaction with himself and his desire for truth by glossing over the extent of the evil which he has committed. It recognises the difference between what he is and what he ought to be with a seriousness which refuses to pay him any flattering compliments. And in the second place, it promises him a moral recovery here and now, an immediate victory based upon the character of God and his own union with the divine nature.

It is far too often supposed that the sense of inward contradiction, the internal strife, the feeling of being confronted by a lower darker self, are experiences which can only naturally belong to some persons of a particular constitution. These experiences undoubtedly vary; they are sometimes comparatively slow and quiet in a vigorous or passionate character, and sometimes violent in the character which is outwardly placid. But the sense of sin is not the idiosyncrasy of a few fantastic temperaments. It besets all men, even those who do not know what it means, and are only vaguely afraid of being outwitted by their better self.

§ 4. *Jesus Christ and Sin.*

Jesus Christ assumed that a moral recovery is needed by all men. No discussion of the Christian doctrine of sin could be complete without a much fuller consideration of Christian ethics than is possible within the compass of this book. But Jesus Christ Himself, as the Christian Church has always believed, must be the touchstone of our goodness and our failure. His character is so universal that it makes an appeal to every one who desires to reach the true standard of manliness. And yet it is full of the vigour of a wholly distinct character. He never once in the Gospel story becomes the insipid wonder-worker of an apocryphal legend. Christ is the Prince of Peace, who, when it is right to do so, enters into the very heart of battle. He loves the solitude of the desert and the mountain, and quiet communion with the Father, yet He is at home in that ordinary life which never seems ordinary when He has entered it. He is the Poet to whom all nature is a book of parables, yet He was so engrossed in active work that He left us not a single written

page. His amazing toleration for the sinful is balanced by His inexorable severity towards self-complacency. If the purpose of His life was to lead men to heaven, it was accomplished by teaching them how to live on earth. His own life is the refutation of current objections to Christian morality which assert that it is hostile to culture, unfavourable to courage and self-respect, and too narrowly ascetic. His enemies called Him a wine-bibber and the friend of publicans and sinners. He uttered no word against the Greek and Roman culture which was detested by the patriotic Jew. He made no secret of His affections. He showed Himself as Man and as imitable. In our next chapter we shall consider more fully what is implied in His claim upon man. At present we can briefly note some of His words about sin, and His method of dealing with it.

Our Lord does not fully define sin. But he describes it by various significant names. It is *σκάνδαλον*, a snare spread for us by an enemy. It is *ἁμαρτία* and *ἁμάρτημα*, the mistake of the man who misses his right way. It is *παράπτωμα*, the transgression of some particular command of God. It is *ἀνομία*, lawlessness violating the law of God as a whole. And as the return to God is life, so separation from God is death. 'This my son was dead, and is alive again,' are the words of the Father who has welcomed His prodigal son.

Our Lord assumes that it is universal, for, although He speaks of 'righteous persons who need no repentance' (*S. Luke* xv. 7), His words are here ironical. And He says, 'None is good save one, even God.' (*S. Mark* x. 18.) The model form of prayer includes the petition, 'Forgive us our trespasses.' We are also taught to pray that we may not be led into temptation, and this implies that there is in all men some bias or inclination towards wrong. Christ teaches that

the true development of life implies self-denial, the false development implies selfishness, and as God is all holiness and all love, sin and selfishness imply distance from God.

(1) Sin is not an external and superficial thing; its root is within. 'That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man' (*S. Mark* vii. 20). Sinfulness does not consist in ignorance of what is right, but in the wish or willingness to do wrong. Hatred is the source of murder, lust is the cause of adultery. In S. John's Gospel, as in the Synoptists, it is assumed that sin is both universal and internal. In *S. John* iii. 17 we see that the whole world needs salvation, in chapter xvi. 8 we see that the Spirit will convince the world of sin.

(2) There is such a thing as a sinful character, a state or condition in which man has become the 'bond-servant of sin.' Sin involves a state of slavery. We should notice that in S. John's Gospel it is very distinctly implied that sin is ignorance. But then it is not mere intellectual ignorance, it is moral ignorance. To walk in darkness and to be full of darkness is the result of a moral shadow between the soul and God. People sometimes speak of the Dualism in the fourth Gospel, the sharp contrast between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, God and the world. But we must remember that S. John's Dualism is not a fatalistic Dualism. Sin is not essential to the universe; it is not fundamental or eternal. Sin is a voluntary perversion of what is good; darkness is the result of that perversion. It may result in a state of complete moral perversion; it may be past remedy. In *S. Mark* iii. 29 our Lord teaches that to ascribe deliberately the work of the Holy Spirit, which is seen to be good, to an evil source, is to be guilty of an eternal sin. The human will can become so identified with evil that moral recovery is impossible. Either all self-control is lost, or action is carefully

directed towards the attainment of what is known to be wrong and is nevertheless preferred.

(3) We cannot fail to notice that a very large proportion of our Lord's teaching about sin is directed against one form or another of pride. The kingdom of heaven is specially promised to 'the poor in spirit' who are not pleased with themselves. He shows us that a sinful tendency to pride is almost as fundamental and common as a tendency to the desires of the flesh. These two tendencies are mutually hostile. The latter produces a sense of degradation, the former a sense of self-contentment. Yet the same person will too often turn from one to the other. Here our Lord's teaching is of peculiar value at the present time. Modern civilisation recognises the conflict between these two evils. It tries to counteract the sins of dissipation by inserting a strong stimulus to ambition. Modern education is to a great extent conducted on this principle. This system has appropriately been called casting out the devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. The doctrines of redemption and grace are ignored. The mind is not turned back to God, the character is not purified. It was not the publicans and harlots whom our Lord stigmatised as a generation of vipers or whom He threatened with hell. It was the people who were satisfied with themselves and quibbled with religion.

Jesus Christ dealt with sin by a method which we cannot understand unless we attempt to see Him as a Person and to gain from Him some idea, however simple, of the 'mind which was in Christ Jesus.' If we do this, we shall be impressed by the way in which He inspires us with reverence for ourselves. The chasm which here separates Christianity from Buddhism is wide and deep. Buddhism claimed to be 'as full of the doctrine of redemption as the sea is full of salt,' but the Buddha's method is not the method of Christ.

Buddhism taught men to look upon themselves as their own redeemers, and at the same time to loathe their life. Christ taught men to look upon Him as their Redeemer, and at the same time to regard their own life as inestimably precious. If they have left their true life, they are to return to it; and it is nothing less or lower than the life of men who are the sons of God. If they have begun to lead the life of sons, they are not to rest where they are, but to endeavour to be 'perfect as He is perfect.' If to the ancient writer of the story of the Fall in *Genesis* life had a significance embracing both our physical and spiritual nature, how deep is the significance of human life and personality in every reference made by Christ to the nature of man! He healed men's minds and bodies. In the simplest and most vigorous language He taught the worth of man. His followers must know that God values them more than the sparrows whom He feeds. Men will risk themselves to rescue a sheep on the Sabbath, all the more should good be done to men on the Sabbath day, and this holy day was instituted on man's account. For a man to gain the whole world and lose his own life is a calamity too deep for words. To lose one's self is an irreparable loss. This life, this self, is worth more than any temporal good or worldly possession; and it is in a healthy condition when it is rich towards God with the endowments on which Christ pronounces His beatitudes.

In all that He says, He shows that He prizes the great possibilities which lie below the hard incrustation of sin. He came 'to seek and to save that which was lost.' Those were lost who had morally lost themselves, who were no longer able to control and reverence themselves. It is an ordinary proverbial sneer that a man may be known by the company that he keeps. And this was the mark of Jesus Christ. He was reckoned as the Friend of publicans and sinners. He

did not love them because they were skilled in sin, but because they were men and women; just as He loved children not because they were ignorant of the difference between right and wrong, but because they were children. When the prodigal son returned to his father, he learned that in his father's eyes he was worth infinitely more than he had imagined, and when the woman who was taken in adultery was told to go and sin no more and rescued from a terrible death, she must have believed that the Son of God came into the world not to condemn it, but to save it. Nor did He come only to save those whom we are apt to regard as the weakest and the worst. He deals with stronger characters by a method which is essentially the same, the same complete insight into sin and weakness and the same unstinted placing of Himself at their disposal. The fierce enthusiasm of S. James and S. John, who wished to call down fire upon a Samaritan village, is rebuked with words that tell them that the wish was unworthy of their best self. The unbelief of S. Thomas is treated with a forbearance which is a conspicuous condemnation of those who have themselves 'believed,' but have been impatient with those who could not at once say to Jesus, 'My Lord and my God.' Everywhere there is the same certainty on His part, and the same assurance given by Him to individual men and women, that they are worth winning and worth saving, worth living for and worth dying for.

CHAPTER II

JESUS CHRIST

§ 1. *Criticism and Christian Tradition.*

The onlooker who observes the controversies of modern theology with regard to the origin of Christianity is apt to suppose that there is an irreconcilable war between criticism and tradition, and to conclude that he can afford to stand outside the Christian Church until the war is finished. It is only right to state quite clearly, that so far as the life of Jesus Christ is concerned, there is no war between criticism as such and tradition as such. The most exact and thorough criticism of the Gospels has been, and is now, carried on by scholars who adhere to the main elements of Christian tradition as they are stated in the Apostles' Creed and the Creed of Nicaea. It is true that they have learned from their adversaries. But the fact that Christian critics have borrowed some principles from non-Christians does not show that they are of inferior mental calibre. To say this would be as unjust as to say that the fact that the Japanese have borrowed some principles of military warfare from Europe, proves that their generals are inferior to those of a European army. And at the present time orthodox critics are doing more than hold their own ground. The really vital and inward war is not between criticism and tradition, but criticism and prejudice. So long as

orthodox writers were ready to maintain that the very ancient but certainly non-Marcan conclusion of S. Mark's Gospel must have been written by S. Mark, and that the very ancient but certainly non-Johannine story of the woman taken in adultery was written by S. John, and that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by S. Paul, they were disregarding criticism, and, in some cases, they were disregarding the best tradition. Prejudice of that sort is happily a thing of the past. But the struggle between criticism and prejudice still continues, mainly because Rationalism is guilty of the very fault which it was wont to lay at the door of orthodoxy. It settles beforehand what the story of Jesus ought to be, instead of inquiring impartially what the story really is. Such a method is neither critical nor historical. For a critic has no right to reject a saying or an action attributed in the Gospels to Christ purely on the *à priori* ground that it is 'out of harmony with Christ's spirit' or that there can be 'nothing supernatural in nature.' Nor is any historian worthy of the name if he becomes a mere machine to register facts, and absolutely refuses to associate himself with the thoughts and aims of his Hero. Criticism and history of this type are the creation of prejudice quite as real as the prejudice which refused to see any discrepancy or admit the possibility of any error in any part of the Bible. Many of the ablest books of modern Rationalism are animated by this sceptical sentiment, which assumes that it is necessary to cut and shuffle the whole of the New Testament to make it agree with the theory that Jesus Christ was only a good man who was gradually deified by His followers. The intellectual obstacles in the way of this process are immense, and they have not been lessened by a hundred years of hard labour. For in the life of Jesus Christ the natural and the supernatural elements are so tightly interwoven that to remove the latter in the hope of retaining the

former only reduces the whole story to a myth. And if the story of Jesus Christ be only a myth, we are obliged to ask how a highly developed myth laden with moral and intellectual significance could be created in so short a period. Six hundred years passed before Arthur the British petty king became transformed by Welsh, Breton, and Norman bards and story-tellers into that mirror of chivalry whom the English loved in the later Middle Ages. It took all that time for the magic bowl of Celtic pagan folklore to become the Holy Grail containing the precious Blood. It is true that in climates favourable to the growth of mythology a very little time is sometimes enough for the development of legends. But then these legends have never been of any vital value to the moral history and progress of the world. And yet we are asked, in fact though not in word, to believe that the transformation of Christ and Christianity, a transformation involving a coherent and elaborate system of doctrine, took place in a period of sixty years. This is to ask us to exchange a belief in miracles for a belief in magic.

Before making such a barter, every man who believes in God may well ask if there is not another and more impartial form of criticism. He will ask whether sin may not be so serious a matter as to make it reasonable to suppose that God would intervene in human history. And though the normal action of God's will may be known to us in the physical laws of nature, it may still be true that in order to realise a pre-ordained plan He has for reasons which are moral and not physical placed in the world a redemptive force. Nor is it unreasonable to think that such a force would at first manifest a contrast and opposition to some of the ordinary laws of nature, which might be occasionally suspended until the new power of moral life and freedom had implanted itself in humanity. An impartial critic will surely be willing to leave room for

such an intervention. Now the first Christians did certainly believe that this intervention had taken place in the Person of Jesus Christ. They believed that the result of sin was moral slavery, and their own lives testified to the fact that they believed Christ to be the source of moral freedom. To them He was the miracle of miracles, because 'in Christ God was reconciling the world unto himself,' and thereby giving to the development of mankind a new and vigorous moral impulse. And, inasmuch as experience cannot prove to us the absolute necessity of all the laws of nature, we cannot logically say that it is impossible that God should have intervened in this manner. If we can conceive that there was any moral necessity for such action on God's part we shall certainly welcome it:—

> 'How helpful could we quote
> But one poor instance where He interposed
> Promptly and surely and beyond mistake
> Between oppression and its victim, closed
> Accounts with sin for once, and bade us wake
> From our long dream that Justice bears no sword
> Or else forgets whereto its sharpness serves!
> So might we safely mock at what unnerves
> Faith now.'

And any welcome which we humbly offer to such a coming of God will certainly not exclude a careful inquiry into the manner of His coming. Confidence in God is one of the truest forms of reverence. And it would be to show little confidence in Him if we were to suppose that the Christian religion would, like some fair human body buried in an ancient church, fall into dust at its first contact with fresh air and light.

§ 2. *The Character of the Early Christians a Testimony to Christ.*

One of the first testimonies to Christ can be derived from the moral life of the early Christians. It is of such a nature that it suggests to us inevitably the personal influence of a Founder. The evidence of the New Testament and of other early Christian writings shows us that there were bad Christians with the characteristic faults of the Greeks, Syrians, and Romans around them. But it also shows that their sins were treated as sins in a rigorous sense of the word, and that there was in existence a clear strong idea of what a Christian man ought to be and do. He was expected to be essentially different from the man who worshipped Nero or Artemis. He was taught to be more disinterested, more full of natural affection, and no less courageous. He was taught that unchastity was selfish and degrading, and the heathen physician Galen expresses his astonishment at the high standard which Christians actually realised in this matter. He was taught to regard murder as far more serious than it was usually believed to be, and taught that to prevent the natural birth of children was a crime like murder. He had a conception of humility which was totally new, and without any parallel in ancient ethics. It is practical and manly, and linked with moral aspiration, quite unlike the mean humility of the Oriental or the self-sufficiency of the Roman. He had a deeper view of suffering, regarding it as a means to perfection instead of necessarily being a mutilation of life. He was readier to forgive injuries, far more self-sacrificing, far more actively compassionate towards the desolate and oppressed. And withal he was not sour but happy. Joy is one of the most unmistakable features

of those who took the Gospel to their heart. The sense of guilt, sorrow and fear, which seems to have dominated many Christians of later ages, was among the Christians of an earlier period subordinate to a joyous sense of new life and new duties. Reflection will certainly strengthen our belief that such a character was the result of knowing a new Personality, whose will included and ruled their own and whose heart gave life to their thoughts. S. Paul has summed up this character by saying that it is 'in Christ'; of whom he also says, 'He loved me and gave himself up for me.' Let us then consider what S. Paul believed Christ to be.

§ 3. *The Testimony of S. Paul to the Person of Christ.*

The testimony of S. Paul is here of peculiar value, for the reason that his Epistles are the earliest writings of the New Testament to which definite dates can be assigned. By 'definite' is meant that in most cases we can with great confidence say that this or that Epistle was written within a period of about two particular years. Now, the earliest date at which the Crucifixion can reasonably be placed is A.D. 29, the latest date that we can give to S. Paul's conversion is A.D. 35, and his death took place about A.D. 65. S. Paul therefore knew great numbers of people who, like himself, were in the prime of life at the time of our Lord's ministry. And for the genuineness of all his Epistles there is enough evidence, internal and external, to satisfy a very exacting criticism. In regard to four of them—those to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians—there has never been any serious doubt. Their genuineness is only denied by a few fanatical non-Christians, who have wholly failed

to convince even the scholars who adopt the same attitude towards religion as themselves. For it is seen that to reject these four Epistles is to strike the name of S. Paul out of the history of the world. And history refuses to tolerate the omission quite as firmly as it refuses to allow the disappearance of Augustus and Nero from its pages. If we grant that only these four Epistles of S. Paul are genuine, we shall have a very impressive outline of S. Paul's belief in Christ. But at present there is a strong tendency, even among non-Christian critics, to grant the genuineness of the *Epistles to the Philippians* and the *Colossians*, the *First Epistle to the Thessalonians* and that to *Philemon*. In *Philippians* and *Colossians* we find a full and explicit theology of which the earlier Epistles contain the presage. It is a strictly logical development of S. Paul's original Christian belief, and it is now admitted to be such.

S. Paul's belief in Christ is stated in a manner which would astound us if we were not hardened by that familiarity which is the foe of real knowledge. And his statements are not more startling than the gaps and omissions which show what he and his converts took for granted. In writing to the Roman Church, which he had not yet visited, as in writing to the Corinthians, whom he had personally converted, and to the Galatians, who were rejecting his authority, he assumes that they all agree with him with regard to the origin and the office of Jesus Christ. The success of his work has been threatened by a party of Jewish Christians, eager, well organised, and clever. With profound emotion and earnestness he argues against their pretension that in order to become a genuine Christian every man must first become a Jew by submitting to circumcision. This argument is intelligible, and it stamps this group of writings with the hall-mark of originality. But one of the most remarkable fea-

tures of the controversy is the omission of any sustained argument on the part of S. Paul with regard to the Person of Jesus Christ. He assumes that with regard to that central point he and his opponents are agreed, although he foresees that the Judaisers, in assailing the character of Christ's work, are on the road towards assailing the nature of His Person. A few years later, in writing to the Colossians, he vigorously maintains the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, because he sees that the false teachers at Colossae are threatening that doctrine directly, though perhaps unconsciously, by the veneration of mediators inferior to Christ. But in the four undisputed Epistles, he never speaks as if his Judaising adversaries denied his teaching about the Person of the Son of God.

Between this teaching in the undisputed Epistles and that in the later 'Epistles of the Imprisonment' there is no real line of cleavage; for in the former Epistles, as in the later, S. Paul without hesitation ascribes to Jesus Christ all the divine functions and attributes except those which belong to God the Father as the ultimate fountain-head of the divine life. And in employing this language with regard to the Son of God, he betrays no consciousness of the idea that his doctrine menaces the unity of God or that his Jewish Christian opponents accused it of this tendency. In the *Epistles to the Philippians* and *Colossians* it is asserted in the clearest and most unequivocal language that Jesus the Son of God possessed, before He came into this world, the form of God; the sharpest distinction is drawn between Him and the angels, and all the creation is said to depend upon Him. It is unnecessary to pile up quotations which prove that in all his Epistles S. Paul's teaching about faith and regeneration would be unintelligible if he did not believe in our Lord's Divinity. He simply worships Jesus Christ with a devotion which, in the eyes of the

orthodox Jew of that time and of the present day, involves sheer idolatry. And it is transparently clear that if this teaching was not the teaching of Christ Himself and that of the original apostles, S. Paul's Jewish Christian opponents could have wrecked his work in every region where the original apostles were respected. They could have procured from S. Peter, S. James, and S. John, behind whose names they tried to conduct their propaganda, a crushing statement to the effect that S. Paul's Gospel was a new Gospel which was really paganism in masquerade. This is a difficulty which Rationalism has never really faced.

The difficulty is not really met, and it is strange that any intelligent student should suppose that it is met, by isolating the evidence of S. Paul by means of elaborate efforts to discredit the writings attributed to the original apostles. The evidence for some of those writings, particularly the *Gospel according to S. John*, his first Epistle, and the *First Epistle of S. Peter*, is far too strong to be easily disposed of. But even if these documents could be proved to be unauthentic, S. Paul's own evidence and the whole subsequent history of Christianity force the same question upon us. Did Jesus become for S. Paul, and for the Roman Church before S. Paul had been at Rome, an essentially different Person from the Jesus known to S. Peter and S. John? All historical evidence is wholly in favour of the belief that He was the same to them all. There is not one shred of proof that the semi-Christian Jews of the second century, whose descendants survived in the time of S. Jerome, really taught what apostolic Christianity taught when they asserted that Jesus was only a human Messiah. This sect does not seem to have even existed until after A.D. 100. S. Paul solemnly declares that the 'pillar' apostles gave him the right hand of fellowship. The author of *Acts*, a book which appears to

be singularly independent of S. Paul's writings, corroborates his words. All the writings attributed to the 'pillar' apostles corroborate them. That is to say, men who were reared in a sternly Monotheistic creed, and men who suffered heavily for their convictions, accepted the teaching of one who speaks of Jesus as the author of 'grace,' the undeserved love of God to man, who represents the creation as His work, who says that He existed with the attributes of God before He came into the world, and calls Him 'God over all blessed for ever.'[1] And if they did not approve of this teaching, if S. Paul lied when he represented them as his friends, those Jewish Christians who virulently opposed him for denying the necessity of circumcision would have secured his downfall within the space of a few months. The only possible explanation of the facts is that the teaching of Christ Himself sanctioned S. Paul's language. Whatever difference there might be in outward expression, the original apostles saw that the inward essence of S. Paul's doctrine was contained in the sayings of Jesus; they saw that his profound devotion to the Master was absolutely the same as their own devotion, the devotion of a human 'bond-servant' to a divine 'Lord.' And, putting aside for the present the fourth Gospel, we can confidently say that the first three Gospels show us how our Lord deliberately created within His disciples this devotion to His Person, and taught them to regard Him as divine.

§ 4. *The Testimony of the Synoptic Gospels to the Person of Christ.*

The portrait of Jesus Christ contained in the Synoptic Gospels is not like some picture by one of

[1] *Romans* ix. 5. To apply these words to the *Father* is to destroy the grammar and to weaken the climax of the sentence.

the old masters which has been retouched and 'restored' by successive generations of well-meaning but sacrilegious painters. It is fresh, living, and strenuous. And we can say quite certainly that in all important features it is the portrait treasured by the Christian Church in A.D. 70 and even before that year. In other words, it shows to us the consciousness of Christ, His own witness to Himself, as interpreted by the faith of those who actually knew Him and lived with Him. It is the story as told about forty years after His crucifixion. And we ask whether the story of the words and acts of Jesus Christ deteriorated in any important particular during that period.

The solution of this grave question is provided by a simple test. It is this. Does the story show the presence of elements derived from the events of those forty years? Can we show any fair proof of its having been dimmed by the religious controversies and the ecclesiastical interests of those forty years? The answer must be negative. The story contains nothing of importance which cannot be far more reasonably attributed to our Lord Himself than to unconscious legend or deliberate invention. It was not the Church which created Jesus Christ, but Jesus Christ who created the Church. If we read the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of S. Paul, we find acute discussions which were of vital moment to the first generation of believers. We find new literary forms and new theological phrases. It would be rash to say that the breath of this expanding life has in no place passed over the Gospel mirror of the ministry of Christ. For instance, it may be reasonably maintained that the *Gospel according to S. Matthew* does occasionally show a deliberate effort to avoid certain little difficulties which might occur to the reader of S. Mark's Gospel. But the space of some forty years has contributed nothing to the substance of the narra-

tive. For instance, the burning controversy about the necessity of circumcision does not appear to have reacted on a single passage in the first three Gospels. Again, there is so little said about our Lord preaching the divine message to the Gentile world, that only a very careful reader would notice that these Gospels contain an instance of our Lord visiting a Gentile population.[1] The relation between justification by faith and justification by works, so hotly discussed some twenty years after the Crucifixion, is indeed shown to us in the story of the woman who was a sinner and the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. But it is shown in a manner which will console the contrite rather than convince the controversialist. The doctrine of man's redemption by the life or blood of Christ, which was recognised as a central doctrine by the apostolic Church, is confined to a few pregnant sentences. There are no rules for the later organisation of the ministry, and the very name of 'apostle,' which emphasises the authority of the Twelve, is less frequent than the name 'disciple,' which emphasises the first stage of their dependence upon the Master. And with regard to the Master Himself, what can be more remarkable than the fact that the title 'Son of Man,' a Jewish title which the Gentiles were not likely to understand, a title which has almost totally disappeared from all other books, is in the Gospels the favourite title used by our Lord to designate Himself?

These are real proofs, the number of which might be greatly multiplied, showing that the truth about our Lord's ministry has not been distorted in the interests of later ecclesiastical belief. Christ, just so far as He entered into human history, subjected Him-

[1] *S. Mark* vii. 24 ff.; *S. Matt.* xv. 29 ff., where note especially v. 31, 'they glorified the God of Israel,'—words which call attention to the fact that the people were not Israelites.

self to the interpretation of human minds which remained human in spite of the new inspiration which they received. We can bear this in mind when we study the account of His miracles as well as that of His teaching. The description of certain well-known miracles of our Lord is coloured by the thought and language of the time, so that delirium, lethargy, and epilepsy are all simply described as possession by some evil spirit. But to colour is not to create. Our Lord in some cases recognised demoniacal possession, and it is incontestable that those who saw Jesus believed that He cured both bodily and mental disease. And as to the Jewish conditions and colouring of our Lord's teaching, it is surely both natural and necessary that, as the Gospel appeared among the Jews, it should wear this vesture. If the Saviour of the world was to appear as the member of a particular human race, it was necessary that He should appear as the Consummator of the deepest religious convictions of that race. Even at the present day Christians and non-Christians show, the one party the fear, the other party the hope, that the worth of Christianity will be diminished if this principle is candidly accepted with all its logical consequences. The Gospel, they think, will seem less true, the Saviour less divine. But it was precisely this planting of the future in the soil of the present, this clothing of the supernatural with the natural, which is the centre of the religion taught by Jesus.

A few words only can here be said as to the literary sources of the Synoptic Gospels. S. Luke at the beginning of his Gospel says that many previous narratives had been drawn up, and that he had himself 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first.' Even among the best scholars there are some variations of opinion as to the sources which S. Luke employed, and also as to the origin of the works of S. Matthew and S. Luke. But recent criti-

cism has done nothing to overthrow, and much to corroborate, the well known assertions of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor, about A.D. 130. He writes, 'Matthew composed the Discourses in the Hebrew tongue, and every one interpreted them as he was able,' and, 'Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered of the things that were either said or done by Christ.' It may be regarded as certain (1) that of the three Synoptic Gospels *Mark* is the earliest, and almost certain that *Matthew* and *Luke* are partly based upon it; and (2) that *Matthew* includes a Greek version of the Hebrew Discourses of our Lord written by S. Matthew; and it may be regarded as almost certain (3) that *Luke* ix. 51—xviii. 14, describing the ministry of our Lord in Peraea, consists of one separate narrative or a combination of separate narratives, which S. Luke regarded as exceptionally important, and inserted bodily into the framework of *Mark*. It is highly probable that this section was largely based on information supplied by some one who was with our Lord during that part of His ministry. It is not possible for us to consider either the distinct sources used by S. Matthew and S. Luke for passages which are peculiar to themselves, or the more minute questions which beset the above theory.[1] But it is worth noticing that even if it should be proved, contrary to the opinion now most commonly received, that the evangelists based their Gospels almost entirely on oral teaching, and did not draw their facts from written documents of any considerable length, the main result will be the same.[2] It is that the Gospels have incor-

[1] An elaborate and valuable account of them is contained in Dr. E. de Witt Burton's *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem* (University of Chicago Press, 1904).

[2] For an important recent statement of this theory see Dr. A. Wright, *The Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge University Press, 1902).

porated three independent records which tell us of essentially the same Christ, and give us the story as it was told by men and women who were contemporaries of the life which they believed to be the life of the Son of God on earth.

For our Lord's teaching we cannot do better than attend to the outline provided by S. Mark. It is the work of a man writing a very uncultured dialect, a man not at all likely to invent a skilful scheme of divine revelation. Yet this revelation is so described as to carry with it an extraordinary air of probability. It shows the great caution which our Lord exercised, His determination to unveil His work and His Person by degrees, and His effort to secure absolute fidelity in the small group which was to be entrusted with the future preaching of the Gospel. He proceeds according to a plan. His preaching, like that of the Baptist, began with a call to repentance and the prophetic announcement that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. He did not begin by proclaiming that He was the Person who establishes that Kingdom, and in the same way when He first sent out His disciples they did not proclaim Him as the Messiah, but only urged the people to repentance in view of the coming Kingdom, cast out devils and healed the sick (*S. Mark* vi. 12, 13). The Jewish conception of the 'Kingdom of God' or 'Kingdom of Heaven' was a living force, and it was not necessary that it should be discarded, but that it should be purified. It was believed by the Jews that God was indeed the King of Israel, but that His Kingdom was partly in abeyance until the sins of His people were sufficiently chastised. But God would one day vindicate Himself by establishing a universal rule. Jerusalem would become the centre of the world, Israel would be supreme, and his enemies would be judged and either rooted out or made his slaves. This dream of the pious Israelites had become

not only patriotic but political, and even somewhat sensuous. But it was a great idea, and our Lord adopted it and placed it in vital connexion with His mission. He makes His teaching 'the Gospel of the Kingdom.' He detaches it from every political association, and represents it as not 'of this world.' It is free to all, and all within it must be free. Men have puzzled themselves again and again in order to find some formula to fit a reality so broad and strong as this Kingdom. It is the influence of God in His fatherly love and holiness and power, but it implies the active co-operation of man as well as the gift of God. It is a communion with God in the sanctuary of the heart, but it expresses itself in the organised form of the Church, a society which can be entered and can be left. It is future, but it is also present. We are taught to pray 'Thy Kingdom come,' and yet the 'violent' are already 'taking it by force,' and it is already spreading unperceived like leaven through a mass of meal.

Our Lord seems at first to have shown Himself chiefly as the perfect representative and embodiment of this new power. And His moral teaching is the first circle that He draws around Himself. This moral teaching is essentially religious, and in its close union between morality and religion it resembles Judaism. And yet it is far removed from it. The later Judaism was conscious of the reality of sin and the need of penitence. Yet this deepening sense of sin was often accompanied by a narrow spirit of exclusiveness which despised not only Greeks, Romans, and Samaritans, but the ordinary people who had not the time to study and understand all the niceties of rabbinical law. But the intense moral severity of Jesus Christ goes hand in hand with a pity that welcomes the weakest human will that is in earnest, and rejoices over the first step that is taken heavenward. And

He was able to pour into the heart of man a certainty of God's forgiveness such as no Jew could attain when he knew that he had failed to fulfil the exacting requirements of the law. He brought with Him the assurance that God is present, and present to forgive. The faith of the Jew was little more than hope; the faith inspired by Christ was a trust in God as in a Father, that brought hope with it as it also brought love. This new revelation of God's character implied a vast change in the idea of the Kingdom of God. The later Israelite conception of the Kingdom of God was practically a conception of Israelites reigning. Israel was to have its own again, and more than what had once been its own. At present it was shattered under Roman rule, but it was to be raised up again under a victorious human Messiah, who would cause all nations to pay tribute to a splendid new Jerusalem on earth.

Now Christ began His work as a prophet to the Jews, and even forbade His disciples to preach among the Gentiles and the Samaritans, a prohibition which He gradually showed must be modified, and finally removed. But He absolutely broke down the whole fence of patriotic nationalism which cramped and confined the Jewish view of God's Kingdom. He not only proclaimed that from the East and the West many should come to recline at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but He also issued laws for the Kingdom which repeatedly imply that it is to be universal and not national. Sometimes indeed His statements, like that which has just been mentioned, are deliberately clothed in a Hebrew form intended to be readily grasped by His hearers. But the substance is never merely Hebrew.

This is almost universally admitted by modern critics, but the admission is not always brought to its logical conclusion. Exactly so far as we realise the nature of

the Kingdom can we realise the Person of the King. The evidence of the Gospels on both these points is astonishingly consistent in spite of its complexity. Any effort to tamper with this evidence in the supposed interests of history and simplicity only increases difficulties, and leads to more and more erasures of the text. Christ slowly detached the hearts of His faithful followers from their belief in a popular Jewish Messiah, just as He detached them from their belief in a nationalist Kingdom of God. He certainly represented Himself as the Messiah. The title was applied to Him by others, and He adopted it when necessary: He assented to it on the night before His death when the high priest asked who He was. The truth that He was this ideal King was in His own mind, as is proved by the Synoptists as well as by the fourth Gospel. Yet He showed the greatest reserve in teaching His Messiahship. He did not wish to be regarded as a King until the nature of His Kingdom was understood. We can trace in S. Mark's Gospel a growth of earnest reflection about His Person. At first those who saw His works of healing asked such questions as 'What thing is this?' or 'What manner of man is this?' or 'From whence hath this man these things?' For a while He usually checked the acknowledgment of His Messiahship when it came from the lips of those who had been diseased. But He did not always enforce silence, and when the time was ripe He appealed to His miracles as a proof that the Kingdom of God had already come. Again, when the disciples of the Baptist came to Him to ask definitely if He was the Messiah, His answer was, 'Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.' He thus

riveted together His teaching, His miracles, and His Messiahship, having shown that He alone could make the Kingdom of God a reality upon earth. Similarly at Caesarea Philippi, when S. Peter acknowledged Him as the Christ, Jesus confirmed his acknowledgment with the most solemn and decisive approval.

But in the meantime He was breaking up and recasting the contemporary idea of the Messiah. One of the principal means which He used in this process was His teaching concerning Himself as 'the Son of Man.' This is a title which in the Old Testament passed through a remarkable evolution. The phrase seems at first to have simply meant man, with an emphasis on the dependence of man upon God, as we find in Ezekiel. Then this significance was enriched by the perception that this dependence implies dignity for the one who is thus dependent. Next, the title became a personification of Israel as reigning in the future and representing God. And the latest Jewish literature uses it as a title for the Messiah executing judgment. Now our Lord emphatically uses it to affirm His authority and His activity in inaugurating the Kingdom of God. He connects it with His power to forgive sins now and His return to judge the world hereafter. But He also employs it to call attention to the pity of One who 'came to seek and to save that which was lost,' His claim upon men's hearts as One 'who hath not where to lay his head,' and the redeeming work of One who came 'not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' The title, as He uses it, is like a dawn which has gathered the light of the stars. In it the power which the Book of Daniel foretells for Israel, and the dignity which the Psalmist claims for the man whom God crowns with glory, is joined with the victory won by suffering in the pathetic Isaianic picture of the Servant of the Lord.

This law of transformation still holds good when we examine the passages in the Synoptists which imply that Jesus is the Son of God. This title was sometimes given by the Jews to the Messiah. But, just as the current Hebrew ideas concerning the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man are completely remodelled, so also we find that in the Gospels the title 'Son of God' is not conterminous with the current Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. To the Jews the phrase 'Son of God' implied primarily an historic though religious function. To our Lord it means an essential communion with God—not merely the communion of an earthly life of sanctity, but such a communion in the divine life as justifies His claim to reveal God and to save man. It may be said that if the Founder of Christianity did indeed desire to be known as the Son of God, it is strange that in the Synoptic Gospels it is only once hinted that our Lord assumed this title Himself, though it is repeatedly given to Him by others. But we cannot confine ourselves to the use of the actual terms, for it is evident that the divine Sonship is continually implied and taught by our Lord in other passages. Our Lord speaks of Himself as the beloved Son and Heir in the parable of the vineyard. He is the King's Son for whom the marriage feast is prepared, and He is the Bridegroom in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins. Even more significant is His use of the words 'My Father.' He constantly calls God 'My Father,' and never calls Him 'Our Father' except in that prayer which was taught in direct answer to the request of His disciples. The unique character of His divine Sonship is emphasised with still greater force in the passages where He speaks of Himself simply as 'the Son.' Thus S. Mark records a saying in which our Lord places 'the Son' apart in the matter of His knowledge (xiii. 32), and S. Matthew has the words, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my

Father, and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.' The unique relationship implied in these words is sometimes contested by the statement that the divine Sonship of Jesus Christ was only moral and not metaphysical. That, like so many anti-theological statements, involves a false antithesis. Ultimately no logical reason can be adduced for saying that if the Sonship was moral it was not also metaphysical. There is only one source of all goodness and of all existence. And the moral claims made by Jesus Christ show that He makes upon us all the claims that God can be supposed to make.

He boldly quotes the ancient commandments and issues His own: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you.' With intense dogmatism He reiterates the words, 'I say,' 'Verily I say.' He exclaims, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' He does not merely exhort the contrite conscience to apply to God for forgiveness. He grants forgiveness. To the man crippled with palsy He says, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven.' To the 'woman which was in the city, a sinner,' who wept at His feet, He gives pardon, treating her sins as though they had been committed against Himself, and adding, 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much.' These are words which we cannot imagine the holiest of creatures daring to affirm concerning the affection of such a penitent for himself. He comes to this or that individual with the brief command, 'Follow me,' and He calls for an immediate break with his previous mode of life. He claims a devotion before which our devotion to father or mother, wife or children, must, if He says it, make an unconditional surrender. If need be, men must be prepared to die for Him and for His Gospel. He

comes as both the present and the future Judge of human conduct. His message is to be received on pain of loss in the life to come. He promises a place in Paradise to the thief dying by His side. He declares that He will be wherever two or three are gathered together in His name. Statements such as these, and some of them occur where He does not press His personality upon men's notice, show why it was that He called the weary and the heavy-laden to Himself, and in what sense He called Himself the Son of God. And either His personality is a riddle to which no answer can be found, or in that suffering, patient, human life we see with the evangelists 'Emmanuel' and 'the Word made flesh.'

§ 5. *The Testimony of S. John's Gospel to the Person of Christ.*

The *Gospel according to S. John* is not only important as completing and explaining much that is narrated in the other Gospels, but as the most intimate witness to the deepest teaching of Christ. The practice of treating it as an allegory or a fiction, worthless as an authority for the ministry of Jesus, is wholly unjustifiable; for the book has resisted the most remorseless criticism to which any book has ever been subjected. The references to it in the literature of the primitive Church are only less conclusive than the evidence contained in the Gospel itself. The precision of its references to the state of Jerusalem, the ceremonies, the sects and beliefs of the first half of the first century, has been conclusively vindicated.[1] And the hopeless

[1] It is hardly necessary to refer to Dr. W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Longmans, 1905), or the important concessions to orthodox tradition made in Dr. James Drummond's *An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (Williams and Norgate, 1903).

contradictions in the theories which have recently been suggested to account for its origin by writers unwilling to believe in its genuineness, would provoke a smile if the theme of the Gospel were less sacred than it is.[1]

If Jesus Christ is really unique, as is usually confessed even by most of those who hesitate to believe in Him, His own explanation of Himself is the only reasonable explanation. And S. John's Gospel is the fitting shrine of that great truth. Its wonderful calm is filled with dramatic movement. We seem to hear the wind blowing 'where it listeth' as we read the conversation held by night with Nicodemus, to see the noonday sun at Jacob's well, to feel that 'it was night' when Judas left the supper room, to greet the dawn when Mary says 'Rabboni' to the risen Lord. And the Son of God, though He rules history and nature, and works great miracles that illustrate His glory, is One to whom nothing human is alien. Could anything be deeper and simpler than 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth,' or the words of Christ about the 'other sheep,' and the command to 'love one another'? This is a Saviour who thinks of His mother while He dies, whose soul was troubled, who wept by a graveside, who thirsted, and said sadly to His disciples before His death, 'None of you asketh me, whither goest thou?' But the very same lips declare, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' and 'Father, . . . thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world,' and 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life.'

This Gospel is not a biography, and it is unfair to blame it for not recording facts which do not bear upon its special purpose. The author asserts in the most explicit fashion that it is a selection, and written 'that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son

[1] A brief summary of these theories may be found in my *Books of the New Testament* (Rivingtons, 1905).

of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name' (xx. 31). For this purpose he chooses a certain group of facts which enabled him and the other disciples to believe, including even the once doubting Thomas. We have seen that S. Matthew records the saying of our Lord, 'No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' This saying gives us a note which dominates the whole of the fourth Gospel. The Son is not a being who eternally existed outside God. He is an eternal personal principle within the divine life, and thus when He assumed human nature He was able to reveal to man that Love, Light, and Life which are in God. Before He thus became human, it was His function to be the Agent of creation and the Light of the conscience. He was not inferior to the Father in any sense which would imply that His nature was less divine, but He was subordinate to the Father inasmuch as He was His expression or living ideal. This is what S. John teaches at the beginning of his Gospel, and the Gospel agrees with what is there laid down. The Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father; the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father; as the Father has life in Himself, He has given to the Son the gift of having life in Himself. God is essentially life, whether life be regarded from a moral or a metaphysical point of view, and the Son possesses life in its completeness. And our Lord affirms that He came down from heaven, that He came from God and will return to God, and that He reveals to His own what He has seen with the Father.

On the other hand it must be observed that S. John, without the least hesitation, speaks of Christians as being 'born of God' (i. 13), and in his first Epistle says that 'every one that loveth is begotten of God' (iv. 7). He did not understand that the divine Sonship

claimed by his Master was wholly isolated, and he attributes to Him words which imply a parallel between the relations of the believer and of the Saviour to the divine Father. Thus Christ affirms that He came from 'above' and is 'not of this world,' and that He 'came from God'; but He also warns His disciples that they will be hated 'because ye are not of the world,' and He says, 'He that is of God, heareth the words of God.' He prays that the union between the faithful themselves, and between them and Himself, may be as the union between Him and the Father. He once more seems to associate the faithful with Himself in this close manner in the words spoken to Mary Magdalene after His resurrection, 'Go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and my God, and your God.'

But while full weight must be given to every passage which implies the great possibilities which are within the reach of every one who is willing to come to the light, it must not be overlooked that these possibilities are only realised through Christ. It is distinctly implied that those who deliberately reject Him are not the sons of God, and nothing is said to show that any man can ever attain to His unique position, or that Christ was only a saintly teacher. 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father, but by me' (xiv. 6), sums up the manifold sayings in which our Lord represents Himself as the necessary intermediary between the Father and the world. His relation to the Father is unique, and His relation to men is unique. Truly man, the Christ who sat weary at Jacob's well and wept at the grave of Lazarus, is separate from man in being sinless (viii. 46; xiv. 30). But He is also separate from man in being the Mediator of truth, life, and judgment. The God whom no one has seen at any time manifests Himself in Him whom He has sent, and who, because He lives with the

Father (viii. 16, 29), translates the mind of the Father into language which can be understood by all who are ready to perform the will of God (iii. 12; vii. 16). The expressions used by our Lord, like those used in the prologue of the Gospel, imply a real subordination of the Son to the Father. There is a filial dependence within the divine Being itself. The name of Father suggests both the causation of life and authority; the name of Son suggests both the derivation of life and obedience. So the Son asserts that He 'lives because of the Father' (vi. 57), He only acts according to the example of the Father (v. 19), He seeks to do the will of the Father and performs the commandment of the Father (v. 30; vi. 38; x. 18). It is quite true that such passages refer to the activity of the Son in His human life, but this activity itself is only a manifestation of a previously existing relationship, and for the obedience of His human life He claims the glory which He had before the world began (xvii. 4, 5).

This doctrine of the mediatorial office of the divine Word or Logos is sometimes considered to be the result of Greek speculation, and it is often pointed out as a proof that this Gospel is a work of the second century, at which time Christianity is supposed to have become amalgamated with Greek paganism. Such a theory can very easily and very profitably be tested. A real amalgamation of Christianity with paganism did take place in the second century, and the Church treated it with the uncompromising hostility which its pretensions deserved. It claimed to rest on genuine traditions derived from the apostles, it revelled in forgeries, and encouraged both intellectual and moral licence. It blanched every human feature of the life of Christ, and it repudiated His true Divinity as well as His true humanity. To the Gnostic, whatever his peculiar sect might be, Christ was neither true God nor true Man, but one link in a chain of the

fantastic beings who were interposed between a remote and unknown God and an inherently evil world. And though it is true that certain Gnostics made use of S. John's phrases, or twisted his teaching into bizarre allegories, there is as much difference between Gnosticism and this Gospel as there is between the New Testament and the Koran. But, quite apart from Gnosticism, we are able to test the authenticity of S. John's doctrine of the Person of Christ.

S. John's doctrine does not in the least stand alone. The opening passages of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and S. Paul's *Epistle to the Colossians*, have the whole Logos doctrine of S. John, although they have not the phrase. All these writers assume that the relation between Jesus Christ and the Father during the life of Jesus on earth was of such a nature as to imply a similar relation in the eternal past. They agree that in the Person of Christ there was revealed in manhood to man an energy and utterance of the divine life which implies a plurality within the unity of God. This belief, which forbids us to dissociate the idea of Jesus Christ and the idea of God, has been of the highest practical religious value, as it was admitted to be by the greatest of English Unitarians, Dr. Martineau.[1] Nor can any philosophical reason be alleged for repudiating the belief that the divine nature does contain the distinctions which this doctrine implies. Further, if the doctrine is unmistakably heard in these writings, it can be overheard in the first three Gospels. A child may think that a piece of bread on a table, or a stone by the roadside, are matters too simple to require an explanation. He learns in time that they are produced by forces of which he had at first no sort of conception. And so it is with many an apparently simple saying in the Synoptic Gospels. Sayings like 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father,'

[1] *The Nineteenth Century*, April, 1895.

either mean something or mean nothing. They are rationally intelligible and morally fruitful if the acts of the Son are really the acts of the Father, as S. John explains them to be. They are, on any other hypothesis, the result of either insolence or delusion.

Again, the essentially Christian character of S. John's doctrine is not really undermined by any connexion which may exist between it and the speculations of Philo. That ingenious Jew, who tried to combine the doctrines of Sinai and Athens, borrowed from the Stoics at least part of his conception of the plurality of God and the function of the Logos. It is more than probable that S. John knew something of the teaching of Philo, and even possible that he borrowed the term Logos from Philo's writings and placed it at the beginning of his prologue in order to appeal to thoughtful Greeks. But the prologue is not to be explained by Philo, but by the Gospel to which it is a prologue. Philo's Logos is a vague something or somebody, a harmonious order upholding the universe. S. John's Logos is clear, precise, and consistent; and if he took the term from Philo he filled it with his own personal experience. To him it is not an order of things, but an expression of God. And as a Palestinian Jew by birth, he works out his great idea on lines that are essentially Jewish. He is convinced that God is a God of light and life, as the Old Testament had taught. In these activities combined and issuing in creation, in the human conscience, and in the crowning revelation of Christ's Person, he sees the Word and the Son of God. This is not the teaching of Philo either at the beginning or at the end. For Philo had no sympathy with teaching which held so exalted a view of material human nature as to think an incarnation possible. And the Logos of which he speaks is not strictly divine, and is by nature as well as by function only an intermediary between God and the world. Traces of this form of

the doctrine of the Logos appear once again in the Christian apologists of the second century. In attempting to explain Christianity to heathen readers, they show to an appreciable degree the effect of Platonic and Stoic speculation. Anxious to vindicate the divine honours which they paid to Christ in a manner which cultivated pagans were likely to understand, they sometimes oscillated between the teaching of S. John and that of the later Greek philosophers. Their tendency is to represent the Father as exclusively transcendent, incapable of entering Himself into the world and the human soul, and for that reason requiring the Logos as an instrument. At this point the apologists teach a dubious philosophy, S. John teaches intuitive religion. He was convinced by experience of the truth of the words of Jesus, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.'

§ 6. *The Atonement and the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ.*

This chapter has, it is hoped, done at least something to show what our Lord was to those who knew Him during 'the days of his flesh.' What he is for the Christian Church now, He was to those who were the witnesses of His life and resurrection. And this will grow clearer to every mind that considers the doctrine of the Atonement as presented to us in the New Testament. The doctrines of our Lord's Divinity and of His Atonement for our sins stand or fall together. And it is well worth noticing that the former doctrine is often indirectly assailed by an attack upon the latter, as the history of modern Unitarianism conclusively proves. The old-fashioned Unitarians, such as the great preacher William Channing, often held a much higher view of our Lord's Person than is usually held

by modern Unitarians. We should be doing them an injustice if we were to suppose that such men deliberately endeavoured to put Christ out of the Christian religion. Their teaching was the result of a natural reaction against the doctrine that Christ died only for a limited number of elect people, and that His sufferings were paid to the Father as a more or less exact equivalent for the sufferings which the elect would have had to endure in hell, if Christ had not died for them. Brought up in an atmosphere in which the Atonement was interpreted not as really a revelation of the love of God but of a crude anthropomorphic justice, and where the sacramental connexion between Christ and the Christian was not adequately valued, they revolted. Channing's statements with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity show us how the repudiation of that doctrine and the kindred truth of the Divinity of Jesus Christ found a lever in a repudiation of the current doctrine of the Atonement. The Unitarians were anxious to overthrow a mean conception of God and to vindicate His Fatherhood. But if they had only returned to the New Testament, they would have discovered the true relation of eighteenth-century Calvinism to primitive Christianity. And they would have seen that the supreme proof of the Fatherhood of God is the truth that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' A supernatural man, such as Channing conceived our Lord to be, or a merely natural man, such as his successors conceived Him to be, is no adequate assurance that God loved the world.

At the present time a similar process is being carried on with infinitely less excuse. In one form or another it is strongly asserted that the relation of the Father towards mankind, having always been a relation of love, was not affected by the death of Christ. That death is represented as a singularly beautiful and

touching example of fidelity to the cause of truth and righteousness, and of confidence in God, but nothing more. The effect which it has upon man is simply to teach him moral heroism, and to make him see that whosoever shall lose his life in any good cause shall preserve it. The effect which Christ's death has upon God's subsequent action is simply ignored. And this practical negation of the redemptive character of Christ's death is almost always united with a practical negation of the truth that Christ is now a source of grace to the believer. Christ is still spoken of as unique, but nothing unique is attributed to Him except part of His teaching and a peculiarly limpid conscience. It is taught that He did no unique work, and that He does no unique work, and in this way His divine personality is set aside as unnecessary. Now, in the New Testament the Person and the work of Christ are inseparable. That book forces the reader to ask, What is Christ's relation to men in order to make it possible that He should die for them? and, Why did Christ come into the world if His relation to God is what He declared it to be? And it answers these questions fully and decisively. But there is a mass of modern theological literature which provides us with totally different answers. According to this theology, Jesus Christ is a great initiator; He conducts man into a moral arena in which He has Himself been victorious, and having placed before the human conscience the great problem of choosing between self-love and self-sacrifice, He leaves man alone in the presence of His heavenly Father. This is the teaching which on the Continent of Europe is ordinarily called 'liberal Protestantism.' It was advocated fifty years ago with the greatest ability by F. C. Baur, and quite lately with nearly equal ability by Harnack and Wernle, whose more popular works have been widely circulated in English translations. It reduces the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ to

limits which seem to have been selected irrespective of Christ's own teaching, and it advocates a theory of His Person intended to correspond with these limited functions. And it claims that it is the true original Gospel. Thus Harnack says that 'the Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son';[1] and Wernle says that 'it was really through St. Paul that the thought of Jesus' death, of sin, and of the atonement for sin, first came to be inseparably connected.'[2] The purpose of our fourth and fifth chapters will be to show that Jesus Christ taught that He died for our sins, and that, having died for us, He is for us the source of forgiveness, regeneration, and life. He taught that He would effect for man a great external transaction and internal transformation, such as are only intelligible on the ground of His being truly God and truly Man.

[1] *What is Christianity?* p. 144.
[2] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 240.

CHAPTER III

ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Introductory.

To deal in any full and exhaustive manner with the subject of Atonement in the Old Testament would require a long treatise. We must therefore content ourselves with noticing the principal features of the sacrificial system and the spirit in which that system was regarded by the Jews in historical times. It is interesting and sometimes important to conjecture what sacrifice may have meant to the Hebrews and their ancestors in periods of which we know extremely little, including the period in which those ancestors were idolaters. But for the Christian doctrine of the Atonement it is infinitely more important to gain as clear a notion as possible of the sacrifices actually described in the Old Testament, and in one way or another familiar to our Lord and His disciples. Philology, which in the study of religions is sometimes as delusive as it is fascinating, here renders us some real assistance. Together with the facts of usage and numerous doctrinal allusions, it enables us to answer the following questions:—

(1) What does the Old Testament mean by the words atoning ransom, atone, atonement? (2) What sacrifices or gifts to God were understood to make God and man 'at one'? (3) By what means did they

effect this result? (4) For what sins were they believed to avail?

The English words 'Atone' and 'Atonement' are employed as translations of the Hebrew word *Kipper*, and kindred words in the Hebrew language. The original Hebrew meaning of this word has been commonly thought to be 'cover over' or 'cover up,' as we might describe ourselves as covering over a hand with a cloth. But a comparison of the Hebrew with the closely related languages, Aramaic and Assyrian, makes it almost certain that the fundamental meaning is to 'wipe clean,' and so to 'make bright.' The idea of whiteness and brightness survives plainly in a kindred Hebrew word meaning 'hoar-frost.'[1] This gives an excellent clue to the meaning of the word 'atone.' But whatever the earliest meaning of the word may have been, whether it was 'cover' or 'cleanse,' it is certain that in the Old Testament the word always bears a metaphorical and not a physical and literal meaning. There is in the Old Testament only one passage in which the word may mean *cover*, and this is a passage which has no directly theological significance. And even here the meaning is half metaphorical. The passage is in *Genesis* xxxii. 20, where Jacob says with regard to his determination to make a gift to Esau, 'I will cover his face with the present.' It is possible that this means to cover his eyes so that he will overlook facts which have previously displeased him. If so, the covering is of the nature of a bribe, although the higher idea of a compensation for previous injustice is not excluded. A passage which is often supposed to be a parallel is to be found in the story of Abraham and Abimelech. The latter feels that he has inadvertently done to Abraham's wife a wrong which her friends may resent, and he gives to Abraham a handsome present on her

[1] See Appendix.

account to show them that he acknowledges the wrong, and with the hope that the thousand pieces of silver may be 'a covering for the eyes.' That is, the present is intended to make them blind to the mistake which has occurred. But the word here employed for 'covering' is *not* a form of the word *Kipper*. This word had already gained a more metaphorical significance. Consequently its occurrence in *Genesis* xxxii. 20 does not warrant us to say clearly that it there signifies a covering. It may rather signify 'make bright' or 'propitiate.' But in either case it does mean that the gift was intended to bring Esau into friendship with Jacob, and secure Jacob from punishment, probably death (cf. *Genesis* xxvii. 42).

The gift offered by Jacob to Esau was of the nature of a ransom or indemnity. And before we study the passages which imply that God receives an atoning ransom from His creatures we may notice that any covering of sin in the sense of hiding it from God is always sternly denounced in the Old Testament. Job indignantly repudiates the idea of covering his transgressions (xxxi. 33), and the general law is expressed in the proverb: 'He that covereth his transgressions shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall obtain mercy' (*Proverbs* xxviii. 13). The law also rigorously forbade the reception of a gift intended to pervert the purposes of justice: 'Thou shalt take no gift: for a gift blindeth them that have sight, and perverteth the words of the righteous' (*Exodus* xxiii. 8). We shall therefore be safe in assuming at the start that an atoning gift made to God was not intended to hide the sin from God, and also that it is not probable that the law which prohibited the bribery of an earthly judge consciously permitted sacrifices intended to bribe the divine Judge to overlook a wrong done by one man to another. On the other hand, it must be fairly stated that there

are some passages in which the word *Kipper* and kindred words imply the conciliation of an offended God. But though they show very different stages of moral development among the Hebrews, there is an almost complete absence of passages which can be interpreted as meaning that God can be bribed to condone an offence. An impartial survey of the passages which speak of an *atoning offering* will now be given, and the meaning of the word will thereby be made clear.

§ 1 (*a*). *The word 'Ransom.'*

The use of the word *Kopher* in the Old Testament shows that it meant an *atoning ransom*, by which the life of a person was *redeemed* from bondage or from the infliction of death. It is an offering which is the equivalent of a life, and so a ransom.

In *Exodus* xxi. 29, 30 it is directed that a man who culpably allows his ox to kill a man or woman 'shall be put to death,' but 'for the ransom of his life' he may be permitted to pay a sum of money laid upon him. He may give to the family of the dead man a compensation which they regard as sufficiently equivalent to the worth of their kinsman for them to pardon the offender. The *Kopher*, or ransom, is here an equivalent for the life of the *slain*; in *Numbers* xxxv. 31, 32 it is regarded as an equivalent for the life of a *murderer*, and to take such a compensation for the life of a murderer is prohibited. The murderer must be put to death unless he abides in the city of refuge; if he leaves such a city no ransom is possible. We may compare with the above passages the solemn verses *Psalm* xlix. 7-9. The teaching of the Psalmist is that no man, however rich he may be, can pay to God a 'ransom' which shall 'redeem' his brother. No one by offering God a substitute

can secure his brother against the death which God has decreed alike for the wise and the foolish. With these passages we may connect certain cases where the idea of paying a ransom for the redemption of a life is rightly treated as incredible or immoral. Thus in *Proverbs* vi. 35 it is implied that an injured husband will be too indignant to take a ransom for adultery; in *Amos* v. 12 false judges are denounced for taking a *Kopher*, or bribe; and in 1 *Samuel* xii. 3 Samuel asks of whose hand he has received a *Kopher* 'to blind mine eyes therewith.'[1] Samuel means that he has never taken a bribe for perverting justice. And, if so, the *Kopher* is a money payment paid to the judge in order to secure a great offender, probably a murderer.

In the Pentateuch, however, the 'Priestly Code' does enjoin men to offer to God a ransom of money in certain cases. In *Exodus* xxx. 12, 13 a tax which is collected from the children of Israel at the time of a census, is regarded from a double point of view. It is intended to be both a means of maintaining the worship of the sanctuary and a ransom from an impending plague. The idea, which occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament, that a numbering of the people would require an atonement, is mainly due to the fact that it was regarded as a probable cause of pride and insolence, perhaps also as an innovation in statecraft of which God might disapprove. The text says: 'When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel, according to those that are numbered of them, then shall they give every man *a ransom for his soul* unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them when thou numberest them.' It is probable that the same idea is connected with

[1] The Septuagint has 'a ransom or even a pair of shoes.' If this reading be correct, Samuel means that he has taken neither a large bribe nor a trifling bribe.

the oblation offered after a computation of the spoil taken from the Midianites (*Numbers* xxxi. 50).

Finally we must notice passages where *Kopher* signifies in some sense suffering by way of substitution. *Proverbs* xxi. 18, 'The wicked is a ransom for the righteous: and the treacherous in the stead of the upright,' signifies that though God's punishment might fall upon all alike, He is satisfied by sending sudden judgments upon the wicked, whose punishment exempts the upright from suffering. In *Isaiah* xliii. 3 God says to the people of Israel, 'I have given Egypt as thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.' In this beautiful and poetical passage God is represented as giving to Babylon the richest countries of the world in order to free Israel, which is personified, from the rule of the Babylonians. Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sheba suffer the indignity of losing their independence that Israel may go free. Another and very interesting conception is found in *Job* xxxiii. 24; xxxvi. 18, the one passage being explicable by the other. The former speaks of a man who is near to death, on whose behalf an angel says, 'Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom,' and the man's flesh becomes once more like a child's. The idea is that the suffering which a man bears patiently, and in which he recognises the chastening of God and not a divine hatred which seeks his annihilation, acts as a ransom and redeems his life from destruction. And in the second passage it is asserted that the evil and the self-sufficient must not deceive himself by thinking that any ransom of money can save him from affliction.

§ 1 (*b*). *The word 'Atone.'*

The use of the word *Kipper* in the Old Testament shows that it meant to atone, to make atonement or

propitiation by doing away with sin, by cleansing it and withdrawing it away from God's sight, so that the effects of God's wrath were averted. And in the same way God Himself is spoken of as *making an atonement* for sins. He *neutralises* and obliterates the sin, He *forgives* it, and this is an atonement. *Kipper* is more complex than any one kindred English word, and the translation of it must therefore be occasionally varied, though its meaning remains substantially the same.

It is first of all worth noticing that we find no direct statement in the Old Testament to the effect that God is propitiated by a sacrifice, or that the atonement is primarily an effect produced upon His 'face' or His anger. There is nothing which exactly corresponds with the 'making bright' or 'covering' of Esau's 'face' by Jacob; such expressions seem to have been instinctively avoided as too anthropomorphic for describing the effect of a sacrifice upon God. The same principle is minutely maintained in the Greek version of the Old Testament. The words ἱλάσκομαι and ἐξιλάσκομαι, which correspond with the word *Kipper*, are never used in the Old Testament with the accusative of the Deity propitiated, except in *Zechariah* vii. 2, where the meaning is 'to intreat the favour of the Lord.' On the contrary, the Greek classical usage was to speak of 'propitiating' a god directly. Although the Hebrew avoids the more anthropomorphic ideas of making atonement, we shall see how much the idea varied, and how it gradually developed from a very imperfect to a very sublime stage.

We must be content with a few typical passages which show the nature of atonement, reserving for the next section of this chapter an account of the priestly atoning sacrifices.

In *Exodus* xxxii. 30, 31, after the Israelites had worshipped the golden calf, Moses, tortured by the thought that God will destroy His people, goes to

meet God in the hope that he may be able to make for them an atonement. He does this by saying, '*Forgive* (*i.e.* Wipe away) their sin, and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.' The covenant has been broken, God has been deeply offended, and to avert the consequences of His wrath Moses offers his own life for that of the people. And God refuses to accept the atonement, and says, 'Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.'

In *Numbers* xxv. we have another instance of the breaking of the covenant. The children of Israel join in the worship of Baal-Peor, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against them for this idolatry and the accompanying whoredom with the Moabite women. Then Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, 'made atonement for the children of Israel' (v. 13), turning away the wrath of God by openly and promptly killing two of the most notable offenders. The meaning of the passage is perfectly clear. The people, as a whole, have broken the covenant and deserve to die, and God sends a plague to destroy them. But the zeal of Phinehas is an unmistakable proof that in the midst of an apostate people there remains some true devotion to the covenant, and by virtue of the zeal which Phinehas displayed, and not on account of the mere punishment which he inflicted, he made an atonement, and God ceased to consume the people.

The grimly dramatic story of the dealing of David with the Gibeonites, in 2 *Samuel* xxi., paints in the most vivid colours the primitive Hebrew idea of atonement. The people are smitten with famine, and David 'sought the face of the Lord.' The answer that he receives is, 'It is for Saul and for his bloody house,[1] because he put to death the Gibeonites.' David then asks the Gibeonites, 'Wherewith shall I make atone-

[1] Or, 'Upon Saul and upon his house there is blood-guiltiness.'

ment?' They understood his question as practically the offer of a money payment, but they refuse silver and gold, and demand that they shall be allowed to 'hang up unto the Lord' seven of Saul's sons. David agrees. Seven were hanged in the days of harvest, and the story tells how Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, the mother of two of the men who were thus killed to make an atonement, watched by the bodies of her dead 'from the beginning of harvest until water was poured upon them from heaven; and she suffered neither the birds of the air to rest on them by day, nor the beasts of the field by night.' After their bones had been at last buried, and the bones of Saul and Jonathan also, 'God was intreated for the land.' In this passage the treacherous murder of the Gibeonites by Saul is regarded from two points of view: it is a wrong done to the clan, for which they are entitled to require an atonement; it is also a wrong done to God, who is the Protector of justice. And all the people of Israel are responsible for the murder until the atonement has been made. When it has been made, the wrath of God, as manifested in the deaths which were caused by famine, disappears. The atonement consists in the punishment of representative members of the guilty race by death. The naked horror of the whole story, with its crude but real sense of the wrong involved in public treachery, exactly serves to show the earlier religious meaning of the word *Kipper*.

Deuteronomy xxi. 1-9 also throws considerable light upon the manner in which the restoration of a broken relationship with God was conceived to be restored. If the body of a murdered man was discovered, and the murderer was unknown, an animal was slain by the city nearest to the spot where the body was discovered. The guilt of shedding blood was supposed to rest upon the whole people, and it was removed in a symbolical fashion by the slaughter of a heifer and an accom-

panying intercession. The animal selected is one never used for work, the place chosen is a spot of virgin soil. The heifer is killed in a manner different from the slaughter of an animal offered in sacrifice, the neck being struck off. The elders of the city wash their hands in water over the heifer, and accompany the act by a protestation of their innocence: 'And the ransom shall be taken for the blood.' The underlying idea is that something corresponding to a ransom ought to be given. A man ought to be slain, but God may dispense with this ransom if He receives a substitute. The substitute is not merely the heifer, but the whole intercessory rite in which the death of the heifer plays a central part. It is not a literal compensation for the murder; but God is believed to declare the sin obliterated so far as the community is concerned. The deed of the murderer implicates the whole community, because it breaks the covenant. If the community can discover the murderer, they must put him to death. If they cannot discover him they must approach God with such marks of contrition as shall show their hatred of the sin committed, and then God forgives them. The community neutralises and wipes away its guilt by a solemn form of intercession and expression of its own sense of justice.

Next, man may be said to *wipe away guilt* by doing right. Thus in *Proverbs* xvi. 6 it is said that 'by mercy and truth iniquity is purged'; and in *Isaiah* xxvii. 9 the iniquity of Jacob, that is, of the children of Israel, will be *purged* if they forsake idolatry, beating their heathen altars into chalk-stones and destroying their images. Here, again, the divine forgiveness is conditioned by some definite action on the part of man. But there are other passages where God purges away sin and forgives it of His own free grace. The passage in which Isaiah speaks of his own call, and which is marked by all the grandeur of inspired imagination,

represents the prophet as overpowered by the vision of God, and, as he recovers his self-possession, only conscious of his own unworthiness. Unlike the seraphs, whose presence symbolises the adoration due to the Creator, he is a man 'of unclean lips.' But an altar is there, with fire burning upon it; and one of the seraphs, taking from it a hot coal, touches the prophet's lips with it and declares that his iniquity is taken away and his sin purged. A real sorrow for sin here meets with absolution, the atonement is God's work, removing both the uncleanness and the guilt.

Thus God's forgiveness and absolution is the making of an atonement. It is a real removal of sin as well as of guilt, and as such can be truly described as the obliteration of sin. God makes atonement by forgiving *the guilty persons*, as in *Deuteronomy* xxi. 8; 2 *Chronicles* xxx. 18. Or He is described as forgiving *their sin*, as in *Daniel* ix. 24; *Jeremiah* xviii. 23; *Psalms* lxv. 3, lxxix. 9, lxxviii. 38; *Ezekiel* xvi. 63. The love of God and the undeserved character of His forgiveness are specially emphasised in the two last passages. The Psalmist, recalling the past mercies of God to Israel, says, 'But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not; yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath.' And Ezekiel, looking to God's mercy in the future, speaks of Him as establishing His covenant in spite of Jerusalem having despised it, and reducing her to the silence of shame when He is pacified for all that she has done. The punishment of Jerusalem is to be on a line with her sins; she has behaved towards God as a wife who has broken her covenant with her husband, and her false lovers will return to strip and stone her. But after she has gone through this discipline, God, without any merit on her part, will forgive her sins by restoring her into that covenant with Him for which she exists.

Thus in the more developed religion of Israel, atonement is God's obliteration of man's sin—an obliteration requiring some form or other of moral submission on the part of the sinner. This conception of the atonement may be said to belong rather to the prophetic than to the liturgical portions of the Old Testament. But these two elements of the Old Testament are not incompatible, and there is one passage where they conspicuously meet and combine. Where the prophetic spirit rises highest, we find not only the introduction of a liturgical idea but even the idea of a vicarious human death. The sublime character of the Servant of Jehovah in the second part of the book of Isaiah is the embodiment of a new covenant between God and the people of God. He is a prophet not to Israel only, but to the world. Innocent Himself, His death is a 'guilt-offering' offered to God for the sins of others, and this death is to be followed by a new and glorious life. We are here in presence of one of the greatest moral laws of history, as well as one of the most dramatic of poems. It is that heroic endurance of undeserved suffering and persecution can effect the moral readjustment of corrupt society, and declare to man the purposes of God. Of many men in some degree, but of only One in the fullest degree, can it be said :—

'Whoso bears the whole heaviness of the wronged world's weight
And puts it by,
It is well with him suffering, though he face man's fate;
How should he die?

Seeing death has no part in him any more, no power
Upon his head;
He has bought his eternity with a little hour,
And is not dead.'

How far the modern poet who wrote these words was thinking of Christ when he thus paraphrased the prophet's teaching we can hardly tell; but the early

Christians were right in perceiving that no one corresponded with the features of the ideal Servant of Jehovah so fully and exactly as Jesus of Nazareth.

We must now consider the sacrificial ritual of Israel more closely.

§ 2. *The Levitical Atoning Sacrifices.*

Propitiation or Atonement is described as the effect of the sacrifices commanded in the Law. To speak more exactly, the priest by means of this or that sacrifice or oblation made atonement for the benefit of an individual or of the whole people. The priest was regarded as vindicating the holiness of God. And he vindicated it by applying to certain persons and objects an atoning rite which symbolically cleansed such persons and objects from sin.

These regular Levitical sacrifices are never described as appeasing God, but as rendering the worshippers fit to receive God's favour. They were a gift to God, and the fact that in the 'Priestly Code' the word *ḳorbān*, or gift, was used for a sacrifice, must imply that the idea of a gift existed in the mind of the Hebrew worshipper. It should also be noticed that the Jewish sacrificial system does not imply the theory of a mere penal substitution, according to which the animal simply suffered death in the stead of the sinner. The opinion that this is the fundamental idea of the Jewish sacrificial system is not only false, but has exercised a mischievous influence on popular views of the Atonement. Even if the theory were correct, it would not necessarily follow that the Christian doctrine of the Atonement has the same character. But inasmuch as the New Testament does employ phrases borrowed from the Levitical legislation, it is at least a welcome fact to know that this legislation involved, at the most,

a symbolic substitution of the thing sacrificed for the sinner (see pp. 77, 82); and further, that the use made of the victim's blood signified that the offerer must be sacrificed with the oblation of the thing sacrificed. The Old Testament ceremonial only implies that the sinner's guilt was transferred to an animal in the case of the scapegoat, which will be considered later on (p. 79). In order to make the meaning of the Levitical sacrifices clearer, they will now be described with some minuteness, simply noticing beforehand that no sacrifices were accepted in atonement for sins meriting death (*Numbers* xv. 30); whereas this would naturally have been the case if the system implied the literal substitution of the victim's death for that of the offerer.

Atonement is predicated of the following sacrifices:

(*a*) The *burnt*-offering.
(*b*) The *guilt*-offering.
(*c*) The *sin*-offering (very frequently).
(*d*) The *sin*-offering and the *burnt*-offering together.
(*e*) Blood in general, as containing the 'soul' or life, as in *Leviticus* xvii. 11; vi. 30; viii. 15; xvi. 27.
(*f*) The 'ram of installation,' and the bread offered at the consecration of the high priest (*Exodus* xxix. 33).
(*g*) The *meal-* and *peace*-offering, only in *Ezekiel* xlv. 15, 17, where they are in conjunction with the burnt-offering; and possibly the meal-offering in *Leviticus* xiv. 20, 31, where it is merely in conjunction with the burnt-offering and sin-offering.

Briefly speaking, Atonement is specially the function of blood, and among sacrifices it specially belongs to the sin-offering. The Rabbinic saying (quoted in *Hebrews* ix. 22), 'there is no atonement except with blood,' is not quite universally true, but it is universally true with regard to the regular sacrifices. The only

exception proves the rule. It is to be found in *Leviticus* v. 13, where a vegetable offering was allowed as a substitute for the usual sin-offering, when the offerer was too poor to give the ordinary sacrifice. It may also be regarded as certain, in spite of some modern critics, that Atonement was not regarded as a means of procuring God's protection for man as weak and as a creature dependent upon his Creator. It was believed not to cover and protect weakness, but to cleanse or neutralise sin. This is shown by the great rarity with which atonement is connected with any offerings other than the sin-offering and the guilt-offering. And no argument can be urged against this principle of interpretation on the ground that atonement was made for physical uncleanness. The Christian applies the word 'sin' to a moral defect of which the guilt depends precisely upon the degree with which the sinner has in his will consented to what he has recognised to be morally wrong. The ancient Hebrew writers used the word 'sin' to include material as well as moral defilement.

The peace-offering or sacrifice of thanksgiving is a sacrificial meal. The animal to be killed was without blemish. It was brought by the offerer to the door of the tent of meeting and killed by him after dedication by the imposition of the hand upon its head. The blood was caught by a priest in a basin and tossed against the altar. The choicest portions were given for food to the officiating priest, and the greater part of the remainder was left with the offerer (*Leviticus* vii. 15). The sacrifice was accompanied by cakes made with oil, as forming the ordinary concomitants of a meal of flesh. To these sacrifices, as noticed above, we find an atoning significance attributed only in *Ezekiel*, and very vaguely. The underlying religious idea of this sacrifice is that of joyful communion of the worshippers with God and with one another.

The other and more distinctively atoning sacrifices will now be described, with special reference to the ceremonial disposal of the blood of the victims.

(i) *The burnt-offering*, *'ōla.* The name *'ōla* signifies 'that which *goes up*' upon the altar, or, possibly, goes up in smoke to the sky. It is also sometimes called *kālīl*, the *whole* burnt-offering, which is *entirely* consumed by fire. The victim might be a bullock, sheep, or goat—in every case a male without blemish, or a turtle-dove or young pigeon. The animal was brought to the court of the Temple, the offerer rested both hands upon its head, slaughtered and flayed it, and cut up the carcase. The blood was caught by a priest in a basin and thrown from the vessel against the altar in such a way that some of the blood struck each of the four faces of the altar. The pieces of the carcase were carried up to the top of the altar, piled on the fire, and burned. The general significance of the burnt-offering is that of an act of entire surrender to God upon the part of the community as a whole, or an individual of it. It is a gift signifying man's homage, the most primitive idea probably involving the notion that God was pleased with the smell of the sacrifice—an idea which certainly did not survive in later Judaism.

(ii) *The sin-offering*, *ḥaṭṭāth.* The victims required by the laws differ in different cases. The offering for a priest or for the whole congregation was a bullock, for a ruler a he-goat, for an ordinary individual a she-goat or lamb, or two turtle-doves or young pigeons, or, in cases of extreme poverty, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense. When the sacrifice consisted of an animal it had to be without blemish. It was brought into the Temple court and dedicated by the offerer laying his hand upon its head. It was then killed by *the offerer*. The distinctive feature of the ceremonial was that the priest ascended to the altar and with his finger put the blood of the

victim upon each of the four horns of the altar. The rest of the blood was poured out at the base of the altar. When the sin-offering was a bullock killed on behalf of a priest, or for the whole community, part of the blood was also sprinkled with the hand seven times before the veil of the sanctuary. The fat portions were burnt upon the altar. The rest of the animal was eaten by the priests, unless it were the bullock offered for a priest or the community. In the latter case, the flesh was burned outside the camp.

(iii) *The guilt-offering*, *āshām*. In the oldest laws this kind of sacrifice seems only to have been required in expiation of the unlawful appropriation of the property of another, or of the tribute due to God. In such cases restitution of the property had to be made, with the addition of one-fifth of its value by way of a fine, and a ram offered as a 'guilt-offering.' The name *āshām* originally meant *guilt*, and then signified the fine by which the offerer was punished, and was afterwards applied to the sacrifice. The animal was killed on the north side of the great altar by the offerer and the blood thrown by the priest against the altar. It was not smeared upon the horns of the altar as in the case of the sin-offering. The flesh of the animal went to the officiating priest or priests.

In both sin- and guilt-offerings the flesh was regarded as 'very holy,' and was only eaten by priests in a state of ceremonial purity. It is therefore obvious that the sin of the offerer was not regarded as transferred to the animal. Otherwise the flesh would have been unclean. The animal, being without blemish, was regarded as typical of a sinless life. God accepts the life of the animal instead of the life of the offerer, the life of the animal being given to God through the blood in which the life resides. God graciously accepts the sinner in one way instead of another. In place of his actual obedience, and in spite of his sin, God accepts him in

his offering which expresses his intention of obedience. The laying on of hands upon the animal signified that it was blessed and dedicated to God, and the blood as the seat of life was regarded as a typical means of refreshing the bond between God and His worshippers, and a way whereby man might approach God. The guilt-offering was essentially a satisfaction offered for the infringement of some right or the withholding of something due. Thus the Philistines rendered an *āshām* for the desecration done to the ark (1 *Samuel* vi. 3, 4). In the guilt-offering sin is viewed as an invasion of God's honour, a sacrilege.

(iv) *The Sacrifices on the Day of Atonement.* The reason for the institution of the Day of Atonement was that the Israelites might annually make a complete atonement for sin, and that the sanctuary might be cleansed. The high priest in humble vesture of white linen made atonement for himself and his 'house,' and then for the people. The ceremonial was long and elaborate. We need only notice that the high priest took into the holy of holies the blood of a bullock as a sin-offering, which he sprinkled once on the mercy-seat, and seven times in front of the mercy-seat. Thus he made atonement for himself and his house. Then he went out into the court and killed a goat as a sin-offering for the congregation. He took the blood into the holy of holies, and did with it as he had done with the blood of the bullock. Thus he made atonement for the whole people, and cleansed the holy of holies from their sins. He then went out into the holy place and placed the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, and thus he is said to 'cleanse' it, and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel (*Leviticus* xvi. 19). When he came out into the court he completed the atonement of the sanctuary by placing on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering some of the blood of both the bullock and the goat,

and sprinkling the blood seven times on the altar. Two goats were set apart for the Day of Atonement—one was chosen by lot for a sin-offering to God, the other chosen for 'Azazel. The meaning of this name is uncertain, but there can be little doubt that it signifies a fallen angel or evil spirit, as was understood long ago by S. Irenaeus. After the sin-offering had been made on behalf of the people, the high priest laid his hands upon the head of the second goat, and confessed over it all the sins of the Israelites, laying them on its head. It was then led into the wilderness. In *Leviticus* it is not said that it was killed, but we are told in the *Mishna* that it was led to a rocky place twelve miles from Jerusalem and precipitated over the rocks. The guilt of the people is here unquestionably regarded as transferred to the victim; 'the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land' (*Leviticus* xvi. 22). Analogies to this rite exist among other nations in an undeveloped stage of civilisation. Its occurrence in the midst of this elaborate scheme of worship is to be explained by the fact that it was a dramatic and symbolic declaration that the people are now purged from guilt, and possibly that this symbolical sending of guilt to one fallen or evil spirit was deliberately intended to check the practice of sacrificing to demons or 'satyrs' (*Leviticus* xvii. 7; 2 *Chronicles* xi. 15), a practice which does appear to have gradually become extinct. But the dismissal of the goat was in brief a visible sign of the remission of sins, a sign only given after the sprinkling of the blood.

In the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement the sacrificial system of the Jews found its climax. It was the highest atoning ceremony of the year, the blood being taken not merely to the altar of burnt-offering, as in other cases (*Leviticus* iv.), or even to the altar of incense, but sprinkled in the holy of holies in the

special presence of God. The sacrifices did not avail for the impenitent, but only for involuntary sins, or sins of which the sinner repented. No one partook of the flesh of the sacrificed goat and bullock, but yet the idea of communion with the thing sacrificed may be truly said to exist in these rites. The sanctuary has to be purified because it is regarded as defiled by the sins committed by the worshippers during the past year. It is purified by the application of blood. That is to say, communication with God is re-established by renewing the bond of life between God and His people. The animals are no doubt slain as a symbol of self-oblation to God, but their blood is a medium of life. It refreshes the sanctity, and so expels the impurity of the whole area in which worship is offered. It thus restores the normal and close relation between God and Israel.

We may therefore assert that the idea of communion was essential to the idea of propitiation.

§ 3. *Atoning Blood.*

This communion was effected by means of the victim's blood, and in the case of the meal-offering and the peace-offering by actually eating the flesh and cakes of meal.

Popular modern theology has erected a false and mischievous separation between the idea of sacrifice and the idea of communion. To propitiate God and to enter into communion with God have been looked upon as two allied but distinct processes, and every one is familiar with the opinion that if the Eucharist be regarded as a communion it cannot be regarded as a sacrifice. And partly on account of the unhappy controversies about the 'sacrament of peace,' a similar opinion about the Atonement has gathered strength. Atonement, whether as made by Christ or as made in

the Jewish sacrifices, has been regarded as completed by the death of the victim. Certainly the general drift of Old Testament doctrine goes in another direction. In the sacrificial system of the Jewish Law, which furnished the writers of the New Testament with types of the work of Christ, communion with the thing offered in sacrifice in some form or other is not an adjunct to the work of propitiation, but is an essential part of it. The writers neither of the Old Testament nor of the New conceived that a sacrifice was less truly a sacrifice because it involved communion. The communion was symbolised both by eating of the thing offered in sacrifice, and by the touch of sacrificial blood, the latter being regarded as the vehicle of life; and the thing which was offered or sacrificed did not avail for the offerer unless that communion was achieved.

Among the Hebrews the profane use of blood was strictly forbidden. Domestic animals were slaughtered at the sacrificial stone, and the blood poured out there, and after the abolition of sacred 'high places' the blood was allowed to drain into the ground (*Deuteronomy* xii. 23, 24).

The extraordinary sacredness of blood is manifested in the least expected manner. Thus when Saul won two victories over the Philistines, and his followers rushed upon the captured cattle, the king ordered a great stone to be placed where the animals might be slaughtered, so that no sin might be committed against God by eating 'with the blood.' That is to say, the blood of the animals had to be poured out at a sacrificial stone before it was lawful to eat the flesh (1 *Samuel* xiv. 32-34). In the same way, the ancient Arabs regarded the pouring out of the blood upon a sacred stone as the essential part of a sacrifice. The practice survives to this day among the Moslems and the Christians of Syria. Animals are still killed at

places dedicated to the memory of some Christian or Moslem saint, and the blood is applied to sacred stones by the worshippers. Such stones have been lately broken by the reforming Wahhabi Moslems, but the old rites were common until the last generation.[1] We have seen that among the Hebrews the greatest care and ceremony were employed in the disposal of blood of the more specifically sacrificial kind.

The reason, though not the whole reason, why blood was employed as the means of atonement is stated in *Leviticus* xvii. 11. Blood has a strong efficacy, because 'the life of the flesh is in the blood.' It is also true that in *Numbers* vii. the technical term for all offerings to the sanctuary is *ḳorbān*, a present, or gift, and the offering of the life of an animal is the most valuable gift that a man can offer. Moreover, the life contained in the blood of a beast is most like the life contained in the blood of a man. We can therefore conceive how men may have come to regard the blood of an animal as a symbolical substitute for their own blood. But this idea does not explain the application of blood to persons and sacred objects. Why the blood should be regarded as possessing a power to purify is evidently a question which lies outside the function of a gift considered merely as a gift. Similar to this power of purification is the use of blood in the covenant ceremony described in *Exodus* xxiv. 4-8. The covenant or compact made between God and His people is there immediately followed by a sacrifice and the sprinkling of the blood, half on the altar and half on the people.

It seems impossible to doubt that these manipulations of sacrificial blood signified a sacramental bond, a communion of life between God and His worshippers. That bond was believed to be strengthened and renewed by the repeated application of the blood of

[1] Samuel Ives Curtiss, *The Expositor*, 1905, vol. xi. p. 415.

animals. In this respect the religion of the Hebrews before they entered Canaan was akin to the original Semitic religion. The Hebrews worshipped one God, whom they believed to be the Creator of the whole earth, but in a peculiarly close communion and covenant with themselves. It was because they were convinced of this relationship that the prophets were able to appeal to them as bound to fulfil the moral commandments of God, and more responsible for their sins than if they had been heathens. So Amos is able to say in the name of God, 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities.' This belief in a mysterious connexion of life between the worshippers and Him whom they worshipped was capable of the very highest spiritual development. It may be true that it goes back to some of the very crudest forms of paganism, similar to that of the Melanesian islanders who offer pieces of their meals to the ghosts of the dead, or domestic servants in the remote parts of Ireland who put food at night in the kitchen for the 'fairies.' That the sacrifices of the Hebrews did originally mean a literally conceived table-companionship between themselves and God, both partaking in the same slaughtered beast, is rendered very probable by the ancient passages which represent God as 'smelling' a sacrifice. And though the Jews came to see that it was unworthy to suppose that God feeds on the flesh of bulls and goats, we have no need to regret the probability that the sacrifices were performed with some consideration of their primitive significance. They symbolised both substitution and communion too obviously for us to think that they were offered merely as unintelligible means which God had commanded. They were means which were at least roughly understood, even by the simple. And that they were understood seems to be proved by the fact that our Lord

and His apostles in the most deliberate way adapted the ancient sacrificial language to the Gospel.

We may lastly notice that the sacrifices of the Law were not considered to be efficacious apart from certain moral and religious conditions on the side of the offerer.

The confession of sin, whether it was done through an act or expressed in a solemn form of words, was essential in the ceremony of sacrifice. Thus it was directed that on the Day of Atonement 'Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins' (*Leviticus* xvi. 21). The same principle is clearly laid down with regard to the guilt-offering, which must be preceded by the guilty man confessing 'that wherein he hath sinned' (*Leviticus* v. 5). And again it is directed that 'When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that soul be guilty, then they shall confess their sin which they have done' (*Numbers* v. 6, 7). That the humiliation of an outward confession of sin is a means of deepening sorrow for sin was a fact which was no doubt present to the Jewish mind. And the better rabbinical teaching most plainly taught that repentance was required for the remission of sins. Rabbi Judah the patriarch, and some others, taught the contrary. He held that the scapegoat atoned for the sins of every Israelite who had not deliberately departed from the religion of his people by atheism or other forms of gross irreverence, independently of his moral disposition. But the prevailing rabbinical view was strongly ethical with regard to this important matter. It was substantially the same as that of Christian theology. For it was taught that genuine repentance implies a resolute turning from sin; and a distinction was made between a repentance which

springs from the love of God, such as Christian theologians call contrition, and a repentance which is only the expression of fear inspired by punishment (*Yōmā* 86 *a b*). The best rabbinical teaching is finely conveyed in the saying: 'Men asked philosophy, What is the consequence of sin? It answered: Evil pursueth sinners (*Proverbs* xiii. 21). They asked prophecy. It answered: The soul that sinneth it shall die (*Ezekiel* xviii. 4). They asked the Law. It answered: Let him bring a trespass offering and it shall be forgiven him. They asked God, and He answered: Let him repent and it shall be forgiven him' (*Jer. Makkōth* 2, 6).

For wrong done to a fellow-man, an elaborate and, indeed, a severe system of compensation was required. The Law provided for ample compensation for all ordinary injuries or losses inflicted by one Israelite on another. The rabbinical doctrine at the beginning of the Christian era was that for transgressions between a man and his fellows the Day of Atonement does not atone until he has propitiated the injured party. This propitiation included reparation for the material injury, the confession of wrong-doing and sorrow, and the obtaining of forgiveness.

It may be asked, If the Rabbis taught so impressively the value of repentance, did the teaching of the Gospels mark a new departure in religion? We can answer 'Yes' without hesitation. A modern Jewish writer, whose name carries great weight in matters of Jewish theology, may be allowed to answer the question in his own words. He says: 'We seem to be cognisant of fresh and original teaching, which has produced fruit to be even reckoned among the distinctive glories of Christianity. It has two aspects: first, the yearning and eager activity to save and redeem; secondly, the special attitude of the Master towards sinners and towards sin. The Rabbis and the Rabbinic religion are keen on repentance, which in their eyes is second

only to the Law; but we do not, I think, find the same passionate eagerness to *cause* repentance, to save the lost, to redeem the sinner. The refusal to allow that any human soul is not capable of emancipation from the bondage of sin, the labour of pity and love among the outcast and the fallen, go back to the Synoptic Gospels and their hero. They were hardly known before His time. And the redemptive method which He inaugurated was new likewise. It was the method of pity and love. There is no paltering with sin; it is not made less odious; but instead of mere threats and condemnations, the chance is given for hope, admiration, and love to work their wonders within the sinner's soul.'[1] In other words, repentance in the Christian system is effected by an infinitely better method, and any change of mind which is produced by a new and better method is itself in a great measure new, and better than any previous corresponding change.

§ 4. *For what Sins did Sacrifice avail?*

Some obscurity rests upon the question as to the sins for which the sacrifices of the Law were believed to avail. This obscurity is caused by the fact that we depend upon documents of very different dates, and also that we are not fully acquainted with the contemporary application of the laws which these documents contain. All the higher religion of Israel enforces the truth that 'the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart' (*Psalm* li. 17). The fullest forgiveness is offered where there is repentance and obedience. 'To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams' (1 *Samuel* xv. 22). Sins which are as scarlet may be made as white

[1] C. G. Montefiore, *Hibbert Journal*, July 1905, pp. 665, 666.

as snow. It is probable that even sins which would exclude the sinner altogether from the Jewish Church are included by the prophets among the sins which can be forgiven. But the Levitical sacrifices were not ordinarily intended to atone for wilful sins. *Leviticus* xvi. and *Ezekiel* xlv. do indeed speak of all sins as if they might be forgiven after sacrifice. But it is apparently assumed that they are not such sins as would exclude the sinner from the Jewish community. The sins for which intercession could be made by means of sacrifice were either real misdeeds committed unintentionally, or some ceremonial and physical uncleanness. It was left to the priest to determine whether a sin was wilful or not, and in *Ecclesiastes* v. 6 a stern moral warning is given to the man who is tempted to say to God's 'messenger' that he has sinned in 'error,' when he has really sinned deliberately.

The basis of Jewish legislation is plain enough. The Jewish Law, especially as contained in *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Numbers*, was chiefly intended to form a hard shell within which the worship of the one true God should be maintained to the exclusion of foreign and lower forms of worship. The political and ceremonial elements are the prominent elements. Hence sin is very often the neglect, conscious or unconscious, of ceremonial laws destined to preserve the distinctness of Hebrew national life and worship. There was not, as yet, any sharp line drawn between unconscious moral offences and ceremonial offences. Moreover, there was no distinction between a sin and a crime. God was the King of the nation, and there was no room left for any law or any offence which was not regarded as strictly concerned with religion. The humane directions of *Deuteronomy* open a wider view of duty. Love of God and love of one's neighbour are there taught in a manner which supplies new motives for the fulfilment of commandments which are

enacted in other books, and new humane directions are added to correspond with these ennobling motives. Yet the fact still remains, and it is assumed by S. Paul in his criticism of the Jewish Law, that in Judaism ceremonial and moral laws had been inextricably twined together in one great system. An offence against the ceremonial law was an offence against the system as a whole, and not an offence which was a mere matter of taste and feeling.

It is here absolutely necessary to add a few words with regard to the offences against ceremonial cleanness, whether of food, persons, or things. Many of these regulations appear to have a sanitary character. Certain rules with regard to bathing, rules prohibiting the eating of pork and other kinds of meat, rules directing the isolation of the leper and the dead, appear extremely natural to every modern reader who is acquainted with the laws of health. To take a very simple instance: it is only in very recent times that the English nation has prohibited the burial of the dead in the midst of even the largest cities, and we feel that Ezekiel was in advance of his age when, in denouncing the encroachment of the palace upon the Temple precincts, he denounced the burial of kings close to the Temple (*Ezekiel* xliii. 7-9). But when we inspect the Hebrew laws more closely, we find that many of these laws were not merely sanitary. They are almost certainly mere codifications of laws which originated at a time when sanitary considerations were not ascendant. On such a subject it is extremely difficult to speak with clear certainty; for the simple reason that some savage peoples at the present day are far more sanitary in their habits than other tribes who live at no great distance from them. But a comparison of the Hebrew laws with those existing among many primitive peoples gives us very good ground for believing that, though these regulations are inciden-

tally sanitary, they were originally based on superstition. It was quite commonly believed by savage races that certain things, and especially *all things connected with birth and death*, were unclean, carrying with them an infection of danger which was spiritual rather than physical. A dead body was probably first regarded as unclean, not because it was physically a danger to the health of those who touched it, but because the spirit of the dead was supposed to haunt the body and to be able to injure any one who came near it. And every single fact connected directly or indirectly with human birth was regarded as unclean on account of the mysterious character of the laws of nature involved—a feeling which had its value in stimulating modesty, reverence, and a fear of sin.

As clear and unmistakable proofs that *atonement* had to be made for an external and ceremonial uncleanness we may notice, first, the fact that the priest had to 'make atonement' for every woman after she had borne a child (*Leviticus* xii. 7), and the offering of two turtle-doves for this purpose was made by the mother of our Lord in accordance with the ancient rule. And we may notice, secondly, that the priest had to 'make atonement' for a man who had the vow of a Nazarite, if any man died 'very suddenly' beside him (*Numbers* vi. 9, 11). In such a case the Nazarite was reckoned as having sinned by reason of the dead, although his offence was of the most purely accidental kind. In the same way, the list of sins for which no atonement could be made included infringements of ceremonial as well as moral laws. In *Leviticus* and in part of *Exodus* ceremonial offences such as the secular use of an oil identical with the sacred oil for anointing the priests (*Exodus* xxx. 32), the failure to offer the blood of a slaughtered animal before the tabernacle (*Leviticus* xvii. 4), and the postponement of the eating of a peace-offering until the third day

after the sacrifice (*Leviticus* xix. 8), are to be punished by exactly the same penalty as that which is imposed in the case of the grossest and most immoral offences against the laws of nature. In all these cases the offending Israelite was to be 'cut off from his people.' Similarly, death is the penalty alike for murder (*Numbers* xxxv. 31) and for Sabbath-breaking (*Exodus* xxxi. 15). We can therefore hardly be surprised that the Scribes and Pharisees developed, or rather perverted, the fourth commandment into a number of minute prohibitions which obscured its original humane intention. And at the same time the fundamental conception of the laws contained in this part of *Exodus*, and in *Leviticus* and *Numbers*, is a noble conception. It endeavoured to secure the holiness of Israel, to keep together a community which, both collectively and individually, should be worthy of the presence of God in its midst. And the Law prevented the disintegration of the nation at the time when Greek culture would otherwise have tended to dissolve all that was most valuable in Jewish thought and best fitted to benefit future ages. But when our Lord began His mission, a point had already been reached when the laws regulating the more trivial matters of ceremonial cleanness, and still more the Pharisaic expansion of those laws, had become a real danger to religious progress. At this point He decisively severed His conduct and His message from the Law of Moses. The distinction between clean and unclean foods, and the observance of certain ritual purifications by washing, He deliberately set aside (*S. Mark* vii. 1-23; *S. Matthew* xv. 1-20). He 'made all meats clean,' and told the seventy disciples to eat and drink what was set before them. The Pharisees fully understood what this action of our Lord with regard to ceremonial defilement implied. It was an open breach with the ancient Law. He had brought morality and the

consciousness of sin to a new stage. We have noticed how the story of the Fall impresses upon us the truth that the first stage of moral consciousness is the instinct that we ought not to do something. The second stage is the reign of Law, when man tries to submit his will to certain commands and prohibitions, without adequately understanding why, and even surrounds these laws with non-moral, irrational, and superstitious additions. But the higher revelation came with Jesus Christ, who has shown us what perfect manhood is, and has thereby equally enlightened the reason and subdued the will.

Out of the complex Jewish system of Atonement our Lord selected the most vital, intelligible, and universal elements. And whether He discards or selects, He appeals with equal force to our conscience, and shows Himself to be 'the end of the Law.'

CHAPTER IV

THE ATONEMENT IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

§ 1. *The Doctrine taught by our Lord Himself.*

The New Testament may be compared with a prism in which the light of Christian doctrine can be seen resolved into its primary colours. For it is obvious that the various Gospels and Epistles show a difference, not only of language, but also of the manner of conceiving the religion which the writers prized so dearly. The contrast between the writers of the first three Gospels alone is remarkable; and that between these writers and S. John, or between S. Paul and the earliest teaching recorded in *Acts*, is still greater. It is exactly this diversity which makes their fundamental unity so impressive, and the coherence of the various doctrines so astonishing. For this unity can only be the result of one great impulse, the teaching of Jesus Christ Himself; and to attribute it either to the brains of cunning harmonisers of the second century, or even to the genius of an apostle, is a mere intellectual diversion, transferring the unique treasure of one brief period into the treasure-chamber of another. Nothing but confusion results from theories which endeavour to show that S. Paul late in his life, or a disciple of S. Paul, or some descendants of his

disciples, devised the teaching which the New Testament attributes to our Lord Himself. In the midst of this teaching shines the doctrine of the Atonement. In its simplest form the doctrine is, that through Jesus and Jesus only, God forgives the sins of mankind, and that the death of Jesus was necessary, not to win the love of God, which is at the heart of God's own life, but to unite the Father and His erring children. This does not mean that those who have never known Christ consciously are not forgiven. Our Lord Himself taught in the most explicit way that He would Himself welcome into the eternal kingdom on the day of judgment members of 'the nations' who were unaware that they had ever seen Him, but had really served Him in ministering to the poor and hungry. And S. Paul, whose soul is thrilled by the doctrine of the Atonement, teaches equally plainly that those who do not know the law will be judged by the law within their own consciences.

But the doctrine does mean that sin is hateful to God as wrecking the spiritual life of His own children; that He punishes sin in order to turn us away from sin; that in His love He sent to man His Son who is the eternal expression of the divine life, and through whom all the creation has been effected; that His Son took a representative human nature and passed through suffering and death without the smallest defection from obedience; and that all men who have the opportunity of so doing must seek the forgiveness of God by regarding the death of Christ as caused by their own sins, and endured to remove those sins, by associating themselves with Christ's filial obedience, and by availing themselves of the new life which Christ supplies. We can for the present lay aside certain grave questions which have greatly perplexed modern theologians, such as—Was the Son punished by the Father? If so, was He punished as our substitute? Did He offer

to the Father a satisfaction or reparation for our sins? To prevent misunderstanding, the author is ready to say that all these questions may legitimately be answered in the affirmative; but they may only be answered thus if we are deeply convinced that God must primarily be regarded as our Father, that no theory which regards Christ as our substitute can be true unless it implies the solidarity of the human race which He represents, and that no punishment is inflicted by God which is not in accordance with the working of moral laws. The Atonement has sometimes been represented in a revolting fashion, which has caused a reactionary denial of the above doctrines even by earnest Christians. If the Father be regarded mainly as a Governor whose life is wholly outside us, if the sufferings of Christ be regarded as some anthropomorphic legal equivalent for the punishment of mankind, if punishment be looked upon as merely an infliction from outside, and if it be supposed that the suffering of Christ dispenses us from strict self-discipline, then we must remove these misconceptions before we speak of Christ as our substitute, or suggest that His sufferings were a punishment and His sacrifice a 'satisfaction.'

The further consideration of some difficulties which are sometimes regarded as moral barriers in the way of accepting the doctrine of the Atonement will be undertaken in later chapters of this book. At present we must content ourselves with considering a historical difficulty. It is sometimes thought that Jesus Christ never taught the doctrine at all, and that he only instructed men with unique clearness and success to go straight to the Father. In favour of this view we are reminded of the petition in the Lord's Prayer in which the Father is asked to 'forgive us our trespasses' without any appeal being made to the mediating work of the Son; or we are told that

the prodigal was met and welcomed by the father without needing any intercessor; and that our Lord Himself spoke of doing 'the will of my Father which is in heaven' (*S. Matthew* vii. 21), as the condition of entering into the kingdom of heaven. On the other hand, there are numerous passages in the Synoptic Gospels which make the salvation of the individual depend upon his personal relations with Jesus Christ; the healing of the soul, like the healing of the body, can only be obtained by the sick man devoting himself to Jesus as his Master. The principle which determines a man's eternal future will be his attitude towards Christ (*S. Matthew* xxv. 40, 45), and the blood of Jesus is shed 'for the remission of sins.' The antithesis is obvious and undeniable. And the difficulty can only be solved in one way, as has been suggested in our second chapter. The mediation of Jesus Christ is necessary for the forgiveness of sins because of His unique divine Sonship. A moralist Christ, a prophet Christ, even a Christ who felt Himself to be the special object of God's love, is not enough to remove the antithesis which we have noted. Men go straight to God when they go to Jesus; they meet God in that Person in whom God reveals His own life fully; and this alone explains the contrast which runs through the teaching of the Gospels. To be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect, is the command which Christ lays upon us; but the path to perfection is a permanent personal faith in Christ, and this faith includes a special relation to His death.

§ 2. *Our Lord's Death a part of His own Plan.*

Several texts in the Gospels represent our Lord as foreseeing that He would die, and the question has

been raised whether He did really foresee this from the beginning, or whether he began to foresee it after the enmity of the Jewish authorities made His death appear inevitable. The latter explanation has become popular among the critics who regard Jesus Christ only as a more or less perfect human moralist. They urge that the Synoptic Gospels show a perceptible change in the attitude of Christ towards His own death during the middle period of His ministry, when He was at Caesarea Philippi. There He definitely predicted His violent death, and He repeated the prediction with greater clearness on subsequent occasions. The historical character of even these comparatively late predictions of our Lord has been disputed, and it has also been asserted that S. John's Gospel is thoroughly unhistorical in attributing to Christ certain veiled allusions to His death quite early in His ministry (*S. John* ii. 19, iii. 14).

But the Gospels are unanimous on this point, and the Synoptists agree with S. John in showing that our Lord alluded to His death at an early period of His ministry (*S. Matthew* ix. 15; *S. Mark* ii. 20; *S. Luke* v. 35). We can compare with such allusions the passages in which our Lord first hinted at His Messiahship, chiefly by His use of the term 'Son of Man.' His teaching with regard to both His Person and His work was slowly and consistently developed from the beginning, and it contains nothing which can be considered as a mere afterthought. 'Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day.' The taking away of the bridegroom is not only death, it is death in the midst of joy, and death which is unexpected and in some fashion premature. In the midst of the outward success which

attends His ministry, Jesus sees what His disciples cannot see—the cloud of the storm which was to break over Himself and them. But we can go back further than this. All the Gospels contain an unmistakable hint that, before the ministry began, Jesus dedicated Himself to the work of atonement. All the Gospels have something to tell us about the baptism of our Lord, and two of them give a detailed account of the temptation which followed His baptism. And these accounts make it plain that our Lord entered upon His work with none of those bright illusions which have been attributed to Him by writers who seem equally incapable of appreciating His sorrows and His greatness. He began His ministry as the Man of Sorrows, not as the dupe of enthusiasm. S. Mark, speaking of the penitents converted by the Baptist, says that they 'were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.' No such confession is recorded as having been made by our Lord; indeed, it is more than probable that instead of a confession of sins He gave some indications of His true dignity in an interview immediately preceding His baptism. The Baptist when asked by our Lord to baptize Him, shrank from such an action as sacrilege, and only consented to perform it when our Lord said, 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' Now, whatever other significance attached to our Lord's baptism, and that significance was important, it meant far more than a mere approval of the Baptist's message. For in the eyes of the Jews who surrounded the forerunner and the Saviour, baptism implied an acknowledgment of sin and of repentance, and our Lord's submission to baptism implies that He deliberately wished to be 'numbered among the transgressors.' He refused to be isolated; He did not even take upon Himself the work of baptizing side by side with John. He entered into the responsibility and the burden of sin, not be-

cause He had any sin of His own, but because He had made Himself one with a race which had sinned. Thus the initial act of His ministry on earth corresponds with His death. That this is a true interpretation of the baptism is suggested by the divine voice by which the Father testified His supreme approval of this self-humiliation of Jesus, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.' The voice speaks in the familiar words of ancient psalm and prophecy. And the words show how our Lord in His own consciousness already combined the office of the royal Messiah with that of the suffering Servant of Jehovah foretold in the Book of Isaiah. They are derived partly from *Psalm* ii. 7 and partly from *Isaiah* xlii. 1 ff. 'Thou art my Son' are the words spoken to the King of all the earth; 'My beloved, in whom I am well pleased' are the words announcing a personification of the people of Israel in one patient and redeeming Martyr. And if Jesus did, before His ministry began, regard Himself truly as the suffering Servant of Jehovah, it follows inevitably that He lived in order that He might die. So far from this being unhistorical, it is woven into the whole tissue of His history.

The temptation which followed the baptism shows a development of the same consciousness in our Lord. The duel between the Son of Man and Satan was a real struggle in which our Lord felt Himself surrounded by the influence of a conscious evil power, and in which, without the smallest propensity or impulse in Himself towards evil, He both felt physical want and saw the inherent attractiveness of an ambitious programme which He hated. No literal mountain exists from which all the kingdoms of the world can be seen, nor is it probable that Satan was permitted to carry our Lord in a material fashion to a pinnacle of the Temple. But though the plastic form in which the temptations are described has sometimes received a materialistic

interpretation which has provoked the assertion that the story is a fiction, the drama is real and the tempter is real. The tempter does not plead, he superciliously suggests with suggestions that harden into commands. First he takes advantage of our Lord's hunger, and desires that the Son of God should distrust God by thinking that He who fed Israel in the wilderness would allow Him to perish with hunger. Then he desires that by a miracle which should be a mere portent, destitute of moral significance, He should both display His trust in God and win the acclamations of the Jews assembled in the Temple. And finally that He should gain a world-wide Messianic empire by worshipping him, the spirit of pride and egotism, who always points the way to unscrupulous success and thereby makes himself 'the prince of this world.' The alternatives placed before our Lord are that of being a political Messiah, and that of reigning over men's hearts as the suffering Servant. And He repudiates definitely and calmly all the magic and the glory of the first course, and chooses the way of weariness and sacrifice. And in the very act by which His choice is made He associates Himself with tempted humanity, just as He had in His baptism associated Himself with repentant humanity. He who revealed God chose to represent mankind.

§ 3. *Our Lord's later Predictions of His Death.*

At Caesarea Philippi, S. Peter in the name of all the twelve disciples confessed that Jesus was the Son of God, and our Lord knew that in spite of His poverty and humiliations they were convinced of His Messiahship, and realised that His Messiahship was a function of His unique divine Sonship. He then felt Himself free to speak of His death. 'From that time,' says

S. Matthew, 'began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem and be killed' (xvi. 21). All the three Synoptists show that He made three deliberate attempts to familiarise His disciples with the thought of the coming tragedy, and S. Mark's language suggests that these were not the only attempts. The lifelike manner in which he depicts the attitude of the disciples on each occasion stamps the record with the mark of a living recollection (*S. Mark* viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 32, and parallel passages in *S. Matthew* and *S. Luke*). The context of the last passage in *S. Mark* is of peculiar pathos and importance. Our Lord and His disciples are on their way to Jerusalem, and He walks separately while they follow in amazement. Then again he takes them aside and makes His third attempt to teach them that He must die. 'The Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again.' It was then that James and John, perhaps dimly realising that His death was the path to victory, came to Him with the ambitious request that they might sit, one on His right hand and the other on His left hand, in glory. He asks them if they are able to drink of the cup which He drinks of, and be baptized with the baptism with which He is baptized. Both these poetic terms, the cup and the baptism, refer to the agony of His death. The cup is the cup which does not make the heart glad, but fills it with dread, and it is received from the Father's hand (*S. Mark* xiv. 36; cf. *S. John* xviii. 11). The baptism is the flood which carries Him away, a flood which He fears but which He desires, because, when it has passed, the fire which He has kindled will have free play (*S. Luke* xii. 49, 50). The cup and the baptism are

to be the lot of James and John as well as His own, and when the other ten disciples show their vexation at the request of their two comrades, our Lord tells them that true greatness consists in service. 'Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

Once again, an attempt has been made to throw doubt upon the authenticity of these words. And once again it must be affirmed that their position in S. Mark's Gospel, which bears so many marks of emanating from S. Peter's own recollection, is strictly defensible. It agrees with the logical sequence of the Gospel, and it agrees with the use of the word 'ransom' in the Greek version of the Old Testament. The ransom is the ransom-price, the price offered for a life, and the two texts mean that by supremacy in service the King of the Kingdom of God shows His royalty, and this service necessitates the giving up of His life in order to purchase from bondage the lives which have been previously brought into bondage. The word 'ransom' emphasises not only the idea of freedom gained for the believer and the great value of the price paid, but also the truth that His life is a substitute offered for our life in profound sympathy. Nothing short of this will satisfy the natural sense of the words employed. They have in recent times been interpreted as meaning that our Lord showed us a noble example by devoting Himself to the service of God and of mankind, and that if we are equally unselfish, if like Him we disregard all worldly ambition, we shall be freed from the cords of sin. This is a meagre meaning to extract from a very sublime passage. It makes it equivalent to saying that if we learn to be thoroughly unselfish and look upon life and death as Christ looked upon them, we shall be set free from sin. Of course we shall be. This is like

telling a man that, when he is perfectly healthy, he will be perfectly free from disease. But the sick man wishes to know how he is to become healthy. This passage by itself does not give him the full prescription of the divine Physician, but it is a very important line in the prescription. For it tells us that, while we too are in no sense exempted from the rigid discipline of service, Christ by dying has secured for us what we cannot secure for ourselves. So long as we are bound by guilt, our lives are forfeited, we are under sentence of death. And the possibility of our freedom from guilt depends upon our relation to Christ's surrender of His own life to God.

The whole passage is cleared up by *Psalm* xlix. 7 f. There we are told that no man can give to God for his brother a ransom so that his brother may live always and not see corruption. What no man can do for his brother, what he must let alone for ever, this the Son of Man claims to do for many, and He claims to do it by giving His own life as a ransom. The fact that a man cannot ransom his own life, any more than he can ransom his brother's life, is put before us in *S. Mark* viii. 34 f. Here our Lord says, 'What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what should a man give in exchange for his life.' When the higher life is lost, is forfeited by sin, we have no adequate means at our disposal for buying it back. But the very purpose for which our Lord came into the world was to win back our higher life for us at the price of His life. The passage therefore does contain a unique doctrine. Christ does what no one else can do; He delivers our life from the bondage of sin and God's judgment on our sin by offering His own life on our behalf.

This text, in which our Lord speaks of His life as a 'ransom,' implies that the atoning gift is paid to God. No other interpretation would correspond with the

teaching about redemption in the Old Testament or with the teaching of the New Testament. This meaning, however, was not always regarded as obvious. There was a tendency in some of the Christian Fathers to regard the ransom as paid to Satan, who was supposed to have acquired rights over the soul of man by virtue of man's sin. This theory, which appears in the writings of Origen, was ignored by some of the Fathers, and strongly reprobated by S. John of Damascus, the great harmoniser of ancient Greek theology. But it lingered in one form or another until it received its death-blow from S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (died A.D. 1109). S. Anselm's own theory, in spite of the rigid manner in which his argument is stated, marked an epoch in theology. And it deserved this success on account of his clear perception that God and only God has a claim on the soul of man, and that Christ's sufferings had an availing worth, not because pain has a value of its own, but because His endurance of pain was the outward expression of a perfect will. Stated in the briefest way, S. Anselm's theory is this. By sin man failed to be what God meant him to be, and therefore he robbed God of an honour which was due to God. He thereby incurred a debt so great that nothing in the universe that was not divine could be an adequate compensation to God. Nothing which was not God could satisfy His claims, and nevertheless it was man who owed the debt. And since it was not consistent with the honour or the justice of God that He should forgive the sins of the world without requiring the payment of this debt, the divine Word became Man and died. In so doing He paid to God something more valuable than that honour of which God was deprived by sin, and something which the Son in His own Person did not owe on His own account. For S. Anselm seems to assume that if the Son had become Man in a sinless world,

He would have owed a perfectly obedient life to the Father, but that this obedience would not have involved death; and hence the death of Christ must be a supreme work of supererogation requiring a special reward. And this reward granted to the Son by the Father is the forgiveness of mankind.

S. Anselm is so modest about his own views that a fair-minded modern reader feels bound to conquer his own dislike of the somewhat irritating logic with which those views are stated. But there is a defect in the *Cur Deus Homo* which must not be overlooked. S. Anselm constructed a theory of the Atonement on the basis of the teaching of Tertullian, that though God is such a Father as no other father, yet man must make amends (*satisfacere*) to God for his sins by humiliation and voluntary self-denial. It cannot be fairly urged that this theory of S. Anselm is untrue to the principle involved in the payment of a 'ransom,' nor was it at all unfitting that in an age of chivalry he should bid men think of God's honour. His defect rather is that his language encourages the idea that sin is quantitative rather than qualitative, and that the debt of man to God can be reckoned arithmetically. He did not mean this. And no man ought to deride his doctrine as 'a commercial theory' before seriously pondering whether our Lord taught 'a commercial theory' when He spoke of the prison from whence the offender will not come until he has paid 'the last farthing.' But S. Anselm's language coincided with an unfortunate tendency in the Western manner of regarding sin. And in spite of the opposition which his theory encountered in the Middle Ages, it is probably true that S. Anselm aggravated that tendency which forgets that a man's sin is not so much what he does as what he is, and that his sin is in him though its effect may also be outside him. When a man sees that sin is death within himself, he knows that the forgive-

ness of his sins cannot take place apart from his co-operation with God in expelling sin. A child who has done something wrong, thinks that when he has been punished and has taken his punishment meekly, his sin has been abolished. Just because the child does not calculate, his mistake is hardly a mistake. But as soon as a man begins to say to himself that so much 'satisfaction' that he is willing to pay ought to be reckoned by God as balancing so much sin, the result is morally disastrous. And the result is equally disastrous when he makes a merit of having no merits, and thinks that the infinite value of Christ's sufferings should exempt him from all discipline. S. Anselm's teaching about the ransom which Christ paid did not sufficiently guard against these two disasters. His representation of sin makes it too external, and he does not show the need of a vital and intimate union between Christ and the Christian.[1] But he was perfectly right in assuming that our Lord meant that He did for us what we cannot do for ourselves, and equally right in indirectly attacking the idea that the Atonement involved a transaction between our Lord and the devil—an idea retained even by the great S. Bernard. And if we have in any way approached towards a true idea of God as our Father, we need have no fear of saying with S. Anselm that the death of Christ was a 'satisfaction' for our sins. This idea is only another form of the idea found in the sublime passage in *Isaiah* liii., where the soul of Him who 'hath borne our griefs' is spoken of as a 'guilt-offering.' It is a reparation for the heartless sacrilege of sin. Christ not only kept His love of men in spite of all their hatred and their selfishness, but His love of the Father persisted through every tribulation which hitherto had seemed to men to disprove

[1] It must not be supposed that S. Anselm included all his teaching about the Atonement in the famous *Cur Deus Homo*. His *Meditations* and other works supply other elements in the doctrine.

the love and the very existence of God. This was indeed to honour the Father by giving Him a human love which was the exact counterpart of His own. The prophet Malachi speaking in the name of God had asked, 'If then I be a father, where is mine honour?' And the answer came in Christ's acceptance of the cross.

§ 4. *The Lord's Supper and the Remission of Sins.*

The Lord's Supper is a perpetual memorial of a further stage in our Lord's doctrine of the Atonement. The 'ransom' is here represented as a sacrifice, and the life which is in bondage is here shown to be set free by the act of God's forgiveness or *remission*. With this sacrifice the disciples are bidden to hold communion.

A consideration of the passages which describe this rite leaves no doubt as to the meaning which our Lord gave to His own action. In saying this we do not ignore certain theories which have been put forward as critical theories, but which are really guesses which set aside the whole testimony of the Gospels and of the primitive Church. Theories which maintain that though Jesus Christ broke bread as a symbol of His death, He nevertheless did not tell His disciples to 'take' it, or maintain that He said nothing to command His disciples to continue the rite in the future, or that though He gave a religious meaning to the broken bread, He attached no similar meaning to the cup, or *vice versa*, remain mere hypotheses. They are of no more real assistance to critical inquiry than the theories which derive the Christian Eucharist from the Eleusinian mysteries, or the orgiastic meal on bleeding bull's flesh in the Thracian worship of Dionysus. Our knowledge of what Jesus Christ really did will never be widened by first imagining what He might

conceivably have done, and then throwing aside the testimony of those who saw what He did, or had at least known those who saw what He did. But there is one point affirmed by the supporters of this school of criticism which demands serious attention. It is that S. Paul having constructed the doctrine that the death of Christ had a redeeming efficacy, the words which imply that this was taught by our Lord in instituting the Eucharist are really unhistorical interpolations. Against this we can say that the traditional view appears to be impregnable. Let us first consider the account given by S. Luke, who is more likely than any other evangelist to show traces of Pauline influence.

S. Luke writes as follows (xxii. 14-21):—

14. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him.
15. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:
16. For I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.
17. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves:
18. For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.
19*a*. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body
19*b*. *which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.*
20. *And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.*
21. But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.

A school of critics, mainly English, have thrown doubt on the authenticity of the words which have been printed above in italics. Three manuscripts representing the Old Latin version in use previous to the Vulgate, and the interesting and important manuscript of the sixth century known as the *Codex Bezae*, omit these words, and in favour of the omission it can be alleged as possible that they are really derived from 1 *Corinthians* xi. 24, 25. But if they are an interpolation taken from that Epistle, who was responsible for the interpolation? It is not likely that they were taken from the Epistle by the author of the Gospel, for it is practically undisputed that our third Gospel and *Acts* are books written by the same author; that the Gospel was written before *Acts*, and that *Acts* was written quite independently of St. Paul's Epistles. It is not easy to suppose that the author of *Acts* had read the Epistles of S. Paul which we now possess, and it is still less easy to suppose that he utilised them for his own works. It is, therefore, not probable that he quoted these words from 1 *Corinthians*. It is equally improbable that they were interpolated by a later scribe. Almost the whole weight of the Greek manuscripts is in favour of their genuineness, and this consideration is so important that it compels us to ask if there is no explanation of the omission which exists in a few copies.

We can find an easy explanation in the fact that the omission does away with an obvious difficulty. The Greek text appears to describe the distribution of *two* Eucharistic cups, one before and one after the words 'This is my body.' This being contrary to the ordinary liturgical usage of the Church, certain Latin scribes omitted the mention of the second cup. That this simple explanation is the true one, is confirmed by the changes made in the same passage by some Syriac manuscripts, and the fact that some Old

Latin manuscripts transpose the mention of the first cup until after the words 'This is my body.' This readily accounts for the omission of verse 20; and verse 19*b* was, we may conjecture, also omitted because certain scribes wished to make the consecration of the bread in S. Luke's Gospel correspond with that in the other Synoptists. Nothing could be more natural on the part of an uncritical scribe than, when he had found the words 'This is my body' in two of the three Gospels which he was copying, to assimilate the words in the third Gospel to the same brief formula. We can, therefore, feel warranted in strongly inclining to the opinion that S. Luke's original account of the Lord's Supper contained *two definite references to the atoning work of Christ.* The body of Christ is 'given for you,' the cup is 'the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.'

We may now notice the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist in *S. Matthew* and *S. Mark.* They contain several interesting points which are comparatively unimportant for the purpose of our inquiry. Thus the fact that many good manuscripts omit the work 'new' before the word 'covenant' is not vitally important, inasmuch as the newness of the covenant is plainly implied. A more interesting divergence is that whereas S. Luke speaks of the blood as poured out *for you*, S. Mark says *for many*, and S. Matthew says *for many unto remission of sins.* Here, as elsewhere, the text of S. Matthew probably depends upon that of S. Mark. And when he adds 'for the remission of sins,' he may possibly be explaining the words found in *S. Mark.* On the other hand, it is quite possible that these words were used by our Lord Himself. For there are passages in the first Gospel, like the great confession of our Lord's divine Sonship by S. Peter, which diverge from S. Mark, but in such a way as to suggest that they are not expansions invented

by tradition or explanations of the author, but fuller historical reports. Even if these words were not uttered by our Lord, we cannot fairly argue that they give a wrong definition to His meaning. The common objection that they do wrongly define it can be removed by a reference to certain passages in the Old Testament which our Lord appears to have had in view at the time.

The first clue to the meaning of the words 'the new covenant in my blood' is to be found in the account given in *Exodus* xxiv. 3-8 of the covenant made between God and His people by Moses. The covenant was sealed by blood, and the words uttered on the occasion were, 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you upon all these conditions.' The sacrifice recorded in *Exodus* consisted of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, the blood of the victims being applied to the altar and to the people. No sin-offerings or guilt-offerings are mentioned. It has therefore been urged that our Lord refers to His death as inaugurating a new covenant relationship between God and His people, but not as an expiatory sacrifice. But this objection is overthrown by the fact that the sacrifices in *Exodus* xxiv. 3-8 were really expiatory—that is, they served to 'cleanse' the offerer by making him symbolically share in a sacrificed life. The life which was offered to God also refreshed the offerer's life, and in so doing expelled his sin and uncleanness. Therefore when our Lord said that His blood was poured out *for many*, His words would naturally imply that it procured the remission of their sins.

The second clue to the meaning of the words 'the new covenant in my blood' is to be found in *Jeremiah* xxxi. Here we have the prophecy of a new covenant of which the very foundation is the forgiveness of sins. 'They shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, for I will forgive their iniquity,

and their sin will I remember no more.' Our Lord thus makes the institution of the Eucharist a focus of the revelation of His work. The old relation between man and God is made obsolete, and the new relation begins; and this relation is not merely sealed by the blood of the Messiah, it is procured by that blood. It is 'in' His blood that the covenant is made. And thus we are carried back to a third passage in the Old Testament, that of the suffering Servant of Jehovah in *Isaiah* liii. The covenant made in *Exodus* is accompanied by the blood of bulls, that in *Jeremiah* is not described as requiring any sacrifice, but in *Isaiah* we have the self-sacrifice of one who is himself a 'guilt-offering.' It is this self-sacrifice of the Servant, strong and tender, resigned and sympathetic, which obliterates the sacrilege of sin and is the prelude to the Sufferer's own new and glorious life, in which He carries out prosperously 'the pleasure of the Lord.' That Jesus Christ wished His disciples to think of Him in this manner is supported by His earlier description of Himself as come 'to minister' and to give His life 'a ransom for many.' And thus the threefold reference to the Old Testament which is contained in the words said over the Eucharistic cup imply a new relation between man and God, a relation of which the foundation is God's forgiveness of man, and the obtaining of that forgiveness through Christ's own death.

There is little or nothing in these words of our Lord's to justify the extreme theories of 'substitution.' But they do imply that the moral sacrifice involved in His death was such as to fully vindicate God's law of holiness. It was the sacrifice of a perfect filial life, a sacrifice which sinful man had neither the purity nor the strength to make. And God our Father is ready to pardon every man who comes into fellowship with that sacrifice and chooses it as his pattern. On the surface it might appear that a sinless man would have

been able to offer this oblation. But a sinless man who was not essentially divine would have been unable to show us all God's willingness to forgive, and unable to cleanse man's conscience by pouring in new life. But this, no less than the oblation of Himself to the Father, is part of the atoning work of Christ.

Only He was able to surrender 'the blood, which is the life,' in such a fashion as to alter the relation between mankind and God. And yet that work is not isolated. He intended it to be fruitful in the production of the same kind of work, the same surrender of life. The law which He lays down before the multitude is, 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me' (*S. Mark* viii. 34). More specifically He says to the sons of Zebedee, 'The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized' (*S. Mark* x. 39). He requires the same devotion and the same self-sacrifice as He had shown Himself; He assumes that the imitation of Himself extends to an imitation of His Passion as well as an imitation of His life. S. Paul accepted this truth with enthusiasm. He says: 'I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church.' This, we cannot doubt, is the devotion which Christ desired. He wished to live in His disciples, to give Himself to them, and in them to work for the redemption of humanity. And when He told His disciples to 'take' and 'eat,' He intended to impart to them a power which would enable them to drink His cup of suffering, to be baptized with His baptism of blood, and to take up a cross like His own. The primitive Christians delighted to see in the Eucharist 'the food of immortality,' but it is equally right to see in it the sustenance of self-sacrifice.

From the days of S. Paul until our own, there are ample proofs to show that Jesus did not miscalculate the power of self-devotion and suffering on behalf of others. Both in the life of communities and of individuals the sufferings and death of the good act upon the conscience. They trouble the conscience and dispose it towards a change. Somehow or other, selfishness and complacency lose their equilibrium when they are confronted by an action or a life which is conspicuously and unostentatiously self-denying. The fact is so familiar in the life of home or in the annals of philanthropy that it is no more in need of illustration than a summer noon is in need of gas lamps. No religion and no philosophy has put suffering endured for the good of others in the same place as Christianity. Not that Christianity has taught that suffering is a good thing in itself, but because it has taught its redemptive power.

§ 5. *Gethsemane and the Desolation on the Cross.*

Between the Supper in the upper room and the death on Calvary there came the agony in Gethsemane. In speaking of any great grief there is always a risk of using words which are tawdry, impertinent, and irreverent. And no man with any depth of feeling would be willing to carry across the brook of Cedron and into the dim grove of olive-trees either a prying curiosity or the 'vacant chaff' of commonplace. No man ever really fathomed another's sorrow, still less the sorrows of the Son of God. But the fact that our Lord allowed three of His disciples to hear a part of His prayer at least warrants an effort on our side to understand why He prayed as He did. S. Mark probably heard of His words directly from S. Peter, and

S. Mark writes that Jesus said, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death,' and prayed, 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt.' The whole story of the agony in Gethsemane as found in the Synoptists shows that He anticipated death with undisguised dread, although He had foreseen it. Now this is not the common spirit of martyrs for religion. The stories of the deaths of the martyrs present us with materials for a psychological study of extraordinary interest. We find every variety of temper in meeting death. There is the sheer bravado of some of the martyrs of the fourth century, a bravado sometimes spiced with taunts which make us think of a tortured Red Indian warrior; or the exquisite dignity of a man like S. Polycarp; or the calmness of some children who died for Christ in China in A.D. 1900, thanking their executioner for the honour which he was about to confer upon them. But the shrinking from death felt by Christ is not only quite unmistakably real, but seems in strong contrast with His courage and resolution.

Physical weakness may account for some part of this shrinking from death. But His spirit did not flinch like that of the man whose dread of coming danger is increased by the uncertainty of its character, and says:

> 'My spirit is too weak; mortality
> Weighs heavily on me like unwilling sleep,
> And each imagined pinnacle and steep
> Of godlike hardship tells me I must die.'

For our Lord had long beforehand spoken quite definitely about His death, had seen it draw near, and gone to meet it. Viewing his life as a whole, we are led to the conclusion that His agony was mainly caused by an increased realisation of the bearing of sin. The horror of sin grew upon His mind. There is much truth

in the words that 'the strongest hearts are the soonest broken,' and the treachery of Judas was typical of the way of the world with Jesus Christ. It was heart-breaking because it was sinful. And our Lord knew that He had brought Himself so near to the world's sin and all unbefriended grief that He would temporarily lose even the sense of the Father's support. In Gethsemane He seems to be anticipating the moment when, stretched upon the cross, He would say, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me.' The cup which He dreaded was the cup of feeling deserted by God. Those pathetic words uttered by the dying Saviour have been more travestied than most of His sayings. They increased the offence of the cross in the eyes of the semi-pagan, semi-Christian sects of early times. The Gnostic sects which nearly submerged Christianity in the second century refused to believe that He really suffered, and the statement that He 'suffered' was probably inserted into the Apostles' Creed as a means of protecting Christianity against Gnostic efforts to explain it away. The idea that the Man who suffered on the cross was some kind of phantom or substitute for the Son of God took a deep hold on the Oriental mind, and it survives in Muhammadanism at the present day.

The words which ancient Gnosticism had perverted in one direction, modern Protestantism perverted in another. Calvin, though he sometimes rises to a nobler estimate of the Atonement, boldly says that Christ endured in His soul the dreadful torments of a condemned and lost man;[1] and Quenstedt[2] says that 'the Saviour endured eternal death and the tortures of hell, not after, but before temporal death, in the garden of Olivet and on the Cross.' The Son was considered to be the object of the wrath of God, and

[1] *Instit.* II. xvi. 10.
[2] *Theologia Didactico-polemica*, Part III. p. 228.

theological calculations were made as to the manner in which His anguish was equivalent to the punishment of the damned.

The monstrous notion that our Lord was suffering the torments of the lost is sufficiently refuted by the fact that on the cross He pardoned the dying thief, He cared for His mother, He prayed for his enemies, He called God '*My* God.' There is a far simpler fact in human experience which can give us a better key to the mystery of His suffering. It is an experience to which a modern artist and novelist has given the name of 'vicarious shame.' We cannot confess another man's sin, as S. Thomas Aquinas pointed out long ago. But we can be sorry for it, and we can be ashamed of it. The depth of that shame will be increased by the depth of the love felt for the one who has done wrong. The Son of God, knowing all the greatness of which the human race is capable, had identified Himself with that race. He had done nothing but live for its good and for its happiness, and saw all its evil concentrated against Himself in the mad cry, 'Crucify Him.' He saw with perfect truth that this was the sin of all sins, the act in which was focused all enmity against God. And the shadow of sin fell most sharply on His soul, because it was so white. He saw its hatefulness with the eyes of perfect knowledge and perfect love. Sometimes when we look at a half-ruined ancient abbey or banqueting-hall, our attention is so much arrested by the picturesqueness of the ruin that we think we would rather look at it in its decay than in its perfection, though no man of education at the present day would be likely to follow the sentimentalists of the eighteenth century who would reduce a fine building to a ruin in order to form an ornament for a new garden. But the original architect who had planned all the loveliness of the ancient church or hall would see what the ruin really involved. He would mourn for the broken

tracery of spacious windows, the clustered columns, and the paradise of colour. Perhaps it is so with sin. Our own ignorance and weakness make us inclined to discover something romantic and picturesque where we might more fitly deplore the loss of real strength and beauty. But Jesus Christ found no melancholy charm or pleasing woe in the sin of man. To Him it was sheer overwhelming misery. The presence of it was a thick darkness which hid from Him the comfort of God. In *Psalm* lxix., which in some ways so wonderfully depicted 'the reproach and the shame and the dishonour' of the Son of Man, the Psalmist prays to be delivered out of 'the mire' and 'the deep waters.' It was not such mire as Dante describes in the *Inferno* as flowing outside the iron walls and the flame-red mosques of the city of Dis, half-drowning for all eternity the souls of the angry and the sullen. And to give the contrast its full meaning we should remember that Dante represents the lost as never uttering, nor able to utter, the name of God. The Psalmist, on the contrary, calls earnestly to God to deliver him from the mire of shame and sin and loneliness. And though, unlike the Psalmist, the Saviour had no sins of His own before His eyes, it was into some such mire that He entered. Solitude is one of the penalties of all moral greatness, it is the burden of all true sorrow, and it is part of the mystery of death. And our Lord in dying chose to endure, for however brief a moment, that accompaniment of death and moral trial which is hardest to bear. His shame passed into desolation of spirit. In feeling vicarious shame, He showed His perfect love for sinners; and in being forsaken by the Father, He experienced the last perplexity of the saint.

§ 6. *The Resurrection and the Remission of Sins.*

This account of the Atonement as presented to us in the Synoptic Gospels cannot be closed without a reference to the final commissions given by our Lord to the disciples after His resurrection. What change or gradual series of changes came over the body of our Lord so as to render it a 'spiritual' body as implied in the words of S. Paul, we can at least only conjecture. Certainly it is evident that we are not encouraged by the evangelists or by S. Paul to think that there was a mere reconstitution of His earthly body so that He came from the tomb like Lazarus and resumed His former ordinary life. Nor perhaps is it possible to bring all the details of the different accounts into one harmonious story; and here again it may be best to confess our ignorance. But there are certain great facts about which we cannot be ignorant. And the principal fact is that the various documents are united in affirming that Christ, unlimited by the conditions of natural life, showed Himself to His disciples under a form which they were able to recognise as His, and convinced them of the reality of His resurrection. The evidence of these documents is not fairly overthrown by the famous 'vision-theory' of Strauss which demolished the absurdities of the older and cruder type of Rationalism. It is essential to the vision-theory that the visionaries should have felt prepared to see what they claimed to see. An excellent modern instance of such a character is afforded by the story of Bernadette Soubirous, the peasant girl of Lourdes, the great centre of modern French devotion to the Blessed Virgin. We have no adequate reason for suspecting the girl of fraud. But she saw, or thought she saw, what she had been prepared to see by her whole training in the

midst of the somewhat sentimental French piety of the middle of the nineteenth century. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which Bernadette believed that S. Mary announced to her, had been taught by influential theologians for generations; it was the darling doctrine of a great party, and it had been proclaimed with the utmost solemnity by Pope Pius IX. Bernadette brought no new message and inspired no new religion. The people who doubted the infallibility of the Pope's pronouncement would *à fortiori* doubt the objective reality of the words which Bernadette believed that she had heard from the lips of Our Lady. Now, modern Rationalism tries to reduce the record of the appearances of the risen Lord to the level of the record of the apparitions at Lourdes. We are no longer told that the apostles were guilty of fraud, but we are assured that they were the victims of hallucination. The assurance is sometimes wrapped in the most delicate and consoling language, and language of a studiously Christian character.

Of the many facts fatal to the 'vision-theory' we must confine ourselves to two. (i) The first is that the disciples were not expecting the resurrection. Our Lord had foretold that He would rise again on the third day. But the terrors of Good Friday made His disciples equally cowardly and incredulous. Only one apostle remained by the cross, and the story shows that even he must have doubted. For no man who expected that his friend would come to life again after a period of three days would tie his body in the bands of Jewish grave-clothes, or embalm it with quantities of myrrh and aloes, or roll in front of the tomb one of the huge wheel-shaped stones used in the graves of Jerusalem. And when our Lord did rise, the disciples were in a frame of mind very different from the expectant docility of a Bernadette Soubirous. They were sad and doubting, and it was only by degrees that

their doubt gave way to certainty and certainty to enthusiasm.

(ii) If Christ did not rise from the dead, the whole apostolic doctrine of the Atonement must be eliminated. The *Acts* and various Epistles show that the apostles regarded the Atonement and the resurrection as inseparable, and the very existence of their Gospel is fatal to the 'vision-theory.' To them the Atonement was, in the strictest and deepest sense of the words, a matter of life and death. And their whole teaching about propitiation requires not only a Christ who has died, but a Christ who is now alive and able to cleanse sins. It was also the solid conviction of the primitive Church that the very heart of the Gospel was explained to the Church orally by the risen Christ. We can test its accuracy by exactly the same methods as we can use to test the historical worth of any other conviction or tradition. The commissions given by our Lord to the disciples fill a precise place in a certain sequence of events; and if those commissions were not given, it becomes extraordinarily difficult to account for the events which happened in the period of twenty years which followed the crucifixion. Now, the witness of all the evangelists is plain. We can say 'all,' because although the primitive ending of S. Mark's Gospel has been lost, it is generally agreed by critics that the original ending has survived in substance in the concluding chapter of *S. Matthew*. Moreover, the present ending of *S. Mark* is itself so ancient that it must be considered to represent at least a common belief of the later apostolic age. And the Gospels are united in teaching that the risen Christ gave to His disciples (i) a world-wide commission, (ii) a command to baptize *or* proclaim the remission of sins. Familiarity has made us look upon these things as obvious, but there is no reason to suppose that they would have been obvious to the first disciples. The

Gospels show that they had been anticipated in our Lord's previous teaching, but comparatively little had been said about the universality of the Gospel, and the remission of sins had not been previously entrusted to the Church. If Jesus had been only a nationalist Jewish Messiah who did not rise from the dead, the disciples would have had no universal Gospel to preach. Further, baptism and the remission of sins were in primitive Christendom inseparably connected; one implied the other. This is not the place to discuss all that is meant by the authority of the Church in remitting sins. All that we are now concerned with is the testimony of the primitive Church that the risen Christ had lodged with her the power to tell men that their sins are forgiven. The subsequent words and actions of the apostles prove that baptism and the remission of sins were with them fundamental. Of course they were not separable from other truths such as the doctrine of the Person of Christ and a new morality. But the forgiveness of sins is that apparently impossible fact which brings with it the other truths of the Gospel into the human heart. We are told by the sceptic that 'there is no more remedy for a bad character than for a bad apple.' And against that assertion Christianity asserts the two paradoxes that the all-holy God forgives sin, and that the God of law changes characters which from our observation of ordinary laws would appear to us to be incapable of change. And if the risen Saviour made the remission of sins the burden of the message which was to be taught to all nations, and if the night before He died He connected that remission of sins with the shedding of His blood and instituted a rite by which the believer is made to share in His own life, Jesus Christ really taught these two sublime paradoxes. He made Atonement—that is, the pardon and neutralising of sin by the offering of His own life to God in death

and our communion with His life, the very crown of His teaching. We may say with all reverence that this teaching, which has no true parallel in the records of religion, is worthy of Jesus Christ. Modern Rationalism has tried to detach these two ideas from Jesus Christ and to attach them to S. Paul. That is to be guilty of both a crime and a blunder. It is the crime of making the Saviour an ordinary man and making S. Paul an idol. And it is the blunder of giving the name of history to a theory towards which every known fact is obstinately refractory.

CHAPTER V

THE ATONEMENT IN THE WRITINGS OF S. JOHN

The evidence given by the *Gospel according to S. John* to our Lord's teaching about the Atonement will now be considered, and then the statements made by S. John in his First Epistle. It is true that these two documents must be placed near the end of the apostle's life, probably after A.D. 80. Therefore in discussing the teaching of this Gospel, we must assume that there was a long interval of time between the events recorded and the date of composition. It is possible that a large part, though not the whole, of the *Revelation of S. John* is earlier than the Gospel, and the greater simplicity of the Gospel is due both to the spiritual growth of the writer and to the fact that it is the result of a first-hand impression of actual intercourse with Jesus Christ. The Gospel is from the beginning to the end a part of the evangelist's own self, but a part which has drawn all its life from one living external source. The evangelist records the teaching of Jesus as it had shaped itself in his own mind, first by contact with our Lord on earth, and then by perpetual communion with the ascended Christ.

In making this strong assertion on behalf of the fourth Gospel no Christian can be fairly accused of being bound to an inherited opinion which he is too weak to throw aside. During the last few years the

wisest and ripest scholarship has pronounced it to be the work of an eye-witness. It is well known that the author never mentions himself by name. But even if we were to admit that tradition may have erred, though it is most unlikely that it did err, in attributing this great book to the Apostle John, the external evidence would be sufficient to show that it was written at the date which tradition requires, and the internal evidence would be sufficient to show that it was written by one who enjoyed the intimate friendship of our Lord. It has become common to insinuate that to depend on the authenticity of the writings of S. John is a mark of either ignorance or insincerity, and to lay those writings aside as valueless whenever the teaching of our Lord is discussed. These insinuations have become a tyrannical conventionality, and are now a serious menace to liberty of thought. Until they have justified themselves better than they have done hitherto, they ought not to make us hesitate for a moment in regarding the writings of S. John as a source of the utmost value for all investigations into the teaching of Jesus. Even if it should eventually be proved that the writer of the fourth Gospel was not S. John, the proofs of its having been written by some one who had actually seen and known our Lord are so numerous that the testimony of the Gospel will remain of the greatest importance.

In S. John's Gospel the atoning work of Christ is fully as important as in the Synoptic Gospels. Modern writers, orthodox or heterodox, have been fond of multiplying antitheses and epigrams to show the difference between this Gospel and the earlier Gospels, or between S. John's teaching and that of S. Paul. But it is not given to many men to speak the truth in epigrams, and no author less readily lends himself to that kind of witticism than S. John. His teaching on the Atonement is deeper and fuller than that of

the Synoptists, as we should expect from one who had known the Master with peculiar intimacy, and one who did not write until he had carefully determined what new facts and truths it was most necessary to record. Again, S. Paul had only known the risen Christ; he therefore necessarily interprets all God's revelation of Himself through the death and subsequent resurrection. But S. John had walked with Jesus and had leaned on His breast, and it is through the whole revelation of God in Christ that he grasps the Atonement. The result of the Atonement, and the very reason why the author writes the Gospel, is that man may possess eternal life. There are two terms to be reconciled: man dead in his sins, and God the source of life. And the life of God is communicated to man through the mediating Person, life, and work of Christ. As the only-begotten Son of God, Christ shares in the fulness of the divine life, and as the object of the Christian's faith He penetrates and transforms the believer with His own life. The complete liberty of faith is taught. Every one who is thirsty for the truth is invited to come and believe, and yet no one comes unless he is drawn by the Father, who only draws those whose will is ready to co-operate with His own. If a man does believe with that profound devotion which morally knows God in Christ, he has already eternal life. S. John does not define life, but he shows that it involves freedom, purity, strength, peace, and joy. Precisely because it is life, it can be lost by the action of the person possessing it. The crude misinterpretation which imagines that S. John means that if a man has once believed in Christ he has secured an inalienable claim to a place in heaven, could not possibly arise in any mind that had observed what characteristics S. John attributes to life.

The distinction between those who believe in Christ

and those who reject Him is stated in the clearest way. Those who believe have eternal life here and now. In the language of S. Paul they are 'justified' and 'sanctified,' in the language most common in the Synoptic Gospels they have received the 'Kingdom of Heaven.' They have answered to the love of God, by which He 'so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life' (iii. 16). On the other hand, 'he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him' (iii. 36); and our Lord also says, 'Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins' (viii. 24). The method of the Atonement is therefore to be found in the fact that the Father gives the Son to live and to die for man, with the result that man is delivered from perishing and from the wrath of God. How magnificent a meaning our Lord attaches to this work of deliverance we can only understand by a close study of this Gospel. He does not go through His mission with the serene felicity of one who is so absorbed in the contemplation of heaven as to be lifted out of common sorrow and common joy. But these common things, such as the mirth of a marriage feast and the mourning by a newly closed grave, become 'a mystic panoply' in which He fights for His great purpose. From the first Christ sees His own thought; the high achievement still unachieved is present with Him. The knowledge of the accomplishment of His mission brings to Him the sense of joy (xv. 11), and the dignity and the fruitfulness of His work penetrate His words with an almost visible glow.

Our Lord regards His crucifixion as the supreme fulfilment of His mission on earth, and joins together His exaltation on the cross and His exaltation into heaven. The cross is regarded as a step on the ascent towards His eternal throne. It is not even considered

as a humiliation which is to be followed, and repaid, by an exaltation. On the contrary, the ignominy of the suffering is itself part of the process of exaltation, being transfigured by the radiance of a dawning victory. After He had entered into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, our Lord said, 'The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified' (xii. 23), and in His great prayer on the evening of the following Thursday, He prayed, 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was' (xvii. 5). As the reward of His obedience in glorifying the Father, He claims for Himself in His human nature that glory which He possessed eternally in His communion with the Father as the divine Son. The passage from which the first of the above texts is quoted shows how His glory will be manifested. He compares Himself to a grain of wheat which only bears fruit if it dies, otherwise 'it abideth by itself alone.' Here our Lord makes His influence depend directly upon His death; because He is to perish, He will be the source of life to others. Immediately afterwards He feels smitten with impending trouble; the 'hour' or crisis is so terrible that He shrinks from it. But He accepts it in spite of its terror, because it is the moment for which He has lived; 'For this cause came I unto this hour.' Now, it is evident that if our Lord's death is to have this fruitful result upon human souls, it must first of all rivet their attention; if it is 'nothing' to all who 'pass by,' it cannot rescue them. But our Lord was certain that He would attract attention, and on three occasions He speaks of Himself being 'lifted up' (iii. 14; viii. 28; xii. 32). Men will look to Him for life as the Israelites looked to the brazen serpent which Moses uplifted in the wilderness. If they care to do so, they will be able to look at Him and be healed. Again, after He has been lifted up,

His hearers will know that He is what from the beginning He has claimed to be; a statement which shows that the ascension is regarded as crowning the crucifixion with its own halo. And lastly we have the memorable words, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself.' S. John interprets this as signifying the manner of our Lord's death, and the previous passage with its mention of the trouble of His soul supports this interpretation. The sovereignty of Christ reigning on the cross, the power of His voluntary impotence, is no dream; it is an influence which has never been arrested for a moment since the first Good Friday. Nothing in the history of mankind has performed the same function, and the glory of the dying Christ is one which no rival can dispute. He showed more than courage and more than patience. The Greeks and Romans were right in prizing courage, for without courage no genius can be truly effective. The Buddhists were right in prizing patience, though to praise a patience which is 'like mud' was to make patience too purely passive. But to be both courageous and patient, and to forgive as Christ forgave, is to do more than a whole army of philosophers. Only God can tell what His example has been to the harshly virtuous, the proudly unforgiving, and to those who without Christ would have been disappointed, sore, and rebellious.

And if in the above sense Christ has drawn all men unto Him, He has also drawn them in another way. Our Lord is the one Person in the history of the world who cannot be ignored. Where He is not loved, He is hated. Every one has heard of the ancient Roman caricature of a soldier who worships a crucified ass, and all students of early Church history know that one of the last methods of attacking Christianity before the persecutions ceased, was to circulate a slanderous account of Christ intended to be used as a school text-

book. Caricatures of His Person and of His life are still to be found in the literature of modern European atheism and of the galvanised revival of Hinduism. And even the philosophers and poets of Europe, when they are writing in deliberate hostility towards Christianity, seem unable to disguise the fact that they have tempered the steel of their tools in the forge of the same Master. Christian thought and Christian language are borrowed with an astonishing freedom by the very men who might reasonably be supposed to be anxious to show the self-sufficiency of naturalism. The truth is that, when they wish to preach progress, they cannot preach it as if Christ had not lived and died. And the same principle, the truth that Christ cannot be ignored, has begun to make itself felt in India and Japan. God has reigned from the tree, as the old Latin hymn declares. Students of ecclesiastical art know that whereas the modern crucifix, dating from the close of the Middle Ages, has represented Christ on the cross as crowned with thorns and desolate—desolate with a desolation which sometimes looks too like defeat, the older crucifixes were an attempt to express a different idea. The feet rest side by side, the body is often clothed, the eyes are open, there is no crown of thorns but sometimes a crown of jewels. These old crucifixes are both a history and a prophecy of the glory of the death of Christ.

> 'We lean
> On things that rot beneath our weight, and wear
> Our strength away in wrestling with the air.'

These words are true of many of the wisest men, but they are not true of the cross or of the Crucified.

Another important passage in which our Lord speaks enigmatically of His own death is in chapter vi., where it is shown to be necessary for the eternal life of man-

kind. It would be difficult to exaggerate the extent to which this chapter has influenced Christian piety and theology. The influence can be traced from the letters of S. Ignatius, written early in the second century, through other writers of that century onward until the present day. Capernaum itself with its busy motley population has been so completely ruined that modern travellers have felt great difficulty in identifying its site. The garden country around it, which was a wonder of delight in the time of Josephus, is dry and deserted. There yet remain the still clear waters of the lake, and the still clear words of Jesus Christ. Happily, modern students are becoming more united with regard to the meaning of this discourse. It is no longer considered to be a sign of Catholic prejudice to find in it an allusion to the Eucharist, in accordance with the view which was held from the earliest times until the sixteenth century. And in order to defend the traditional view it is not considered necessary to maintain that the whole discourse primarily refers to that sacrament. It contains three distinct though closely connected sections, with a short subsequent explanation. The first section is Christological, dealing mainly with our Lord's own Person; the second is Soteriological, gradually preparing His hearers to think of His death; the third is Eucharistic, speaking still more definitely of His death and of the assimilation of His life by the believer. The whole discourse is remarkably coherent; and however much it may have been compressed by the evangelist, we can see how wonderfully it was adapted to stimulate the thought of those who were prepared to accept Him. Let us examine it a little more closely.

On the previous day He had fed five thousand men, besides women and children, on five barley loaves and two fishes. This miracle was performed on the other side of the lake, but the crowd had followed

Him to Capernaum. Our Lord gently rebukes them because they had only followed Him on account of material food. And in full confirmation of the subsequent teaching of S. Paul, He declares that the work which God requires of them is 'that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.' They then ask for a 'sign,' and show that they wish to see a miracle corresponding with the descent of manna from heaven. Our Lord's reply is to contrast Himself as the spiritual and permanent Bread with all meat that perishes, even the manna. S. John, with one of those little historical touches which show his essential agreement with the Synoptists, records that on the previous day the crowd had wished 'to make him king'; they had been eager to deck Jesus forcibly with the crude dignity of a popular Messiah. This our Lord would not tolerate. He makes a much higher claim; He proclaims Himself as 'the bread of God which cometh down out of heaven, and giveth life unto the world.' And just as He had taught the Samaritan woman that 'whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst,' so now He says, 'He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' He also promises to raise up the believer 'at the last day.' In this section of His discourse He has required belief in Himself as the living Lord (vi. 26-40).

The Jews at once fasten on the statement that He is 'the bread which came down out of heaven.' They deny this statement that He existed before He came on earth by saying that they know His father Joseph and His mother—another verse which is of interest as illustrating the agreement between S. John and the Synoptists; for S. John, in spite of his exalted doctrine of Christ's Person, does not hesitate to represent the Jews as ignorant of His miraculous birth, exactly as is done by the Synoptists, who record that birth. Our

Lord does not pause to say anything directly about His birth, but declares that He is 'from God,' repeats that He is the bread of life, and finally adds, 'I am *the living bread* which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my *flesh*, for the life of the world.' This is no unsympathetic clumsy repetition of what has been stated before. By calling Himself 'the living bread' our Lord asserts that He is the centre and not merely the channel of life, and the first mention of the word *flesh* hints that it is through His Passion that He becomes the food of the believer. The giving of His flesh is the giving of His human nature to death. It is the action of the Good Shepherd who 'layeth down his life for the sheep.' Eating of the bread which Christ gives is not merely that belief in Him which He had required from the first; it is faith in Christ as crucified (vi. 51).

The third section reaches the culminating point in the faith required of the believer (vi. 52-59). The Jews ask, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' Our Lord then definitely speaks of the necessity of eating His flesh and *drinking His blood.* He here shows more fully how He becomes a principle of new life to the believer. It is quite unreasonable to interpret the words 'my flesh' and 'my blood' in this section, or even the words 'my flesh' in the previous section, as simply a more pictorial manner of saying 'Me.' Such an interpretation not only entirely robs the passage of its striking originality, but it obscures what is, on this very hypothesis, the purpose of the Speaker. For if our Lord had intended only to insist on the necessity of faith in His incarnate Person, He could not possibly have gone on to confuse His hearers by disintegrating His human nature into 'flesh' and 'blood.' This objection cannot be escaped by the theory that the flesh and the blood together signify

human nature in its frailty. Our Lord's hearers understood Him not to be insisting upon His weakness but upon His highly supernatural power; and the reproach which He afterwards administers to the wider and more incredulous circle of His disciples is not that they have failed to recognise that His lowliness and His weak human nature are compatible with His claim to be the Messiah, but that they do not grasp the profoundly spiritual character of His Person and His communication of life. The flesh and the blood must mean the body as affected by a violent death; and when our Lord exactly a year later, at the next Passover, instituted the sacrament of His body and His blood, the small band of faithful disciples were in a position to understand His meaning. The Christians for whom S. John wrote would also as naturally and inevitably see an allusion to the Eucharist in these words, as they would see an allusion to baptism in Christ's conversation with Nicodemus. The Eucharist, around which the whole religious and social life of the primitive Church centred, was based on the historical fact which is here foretold, namely, that the Son of God by His death gave life to the world.

Here we seem to have reached a contradiction. The discourse which we have reviewed has seemed, first, to say that spiritual life is to be assimilated by faith in a living Saviour, and then, as it were, to contradict this by saying that this life is to be assimilated by eating and drinking, in some way hereafter to be defined, what is *tanquam cadaver*—a dead Christ. There is only one way of reconciling these two apparently contradictory doctrines. It is by recognising, first, that the act of communion with the flesh and the blood of Christ is not an act separable from faith, but is an exalted act of faith by which man appropriates something which exists outside him and which is not created by his faith or his imagination. Communion

is the consummation of faith. Secondly, the death of Christ is not by itself the completion of the Atonement, but the essential condition of the bestowal of eternal life which completes the Atonement in each Christian separately. A dead Christ is not and cannot be 'the living bread' of man. The distribution of His flesh and His blood presupposes His death, and in view of the close connexion which we have already seen to exist between the Jewish idea of sacrifice and communion, we may fairly say that it presupposes a sacrificial death. But He does not feed man with a corpse, nor does man appropriate Christ by thinking reverently of Christ as a dead Christ. The idea is not this, but that Christ through death attains a more abundant life, and so lives that He is capable of extending His own life in those who approach Him by faith. In view of His teaching given on the night before the crucifixion, we are warranted in saying that in order to extend and multiply this life He employs external symbols and a tangible action performed by the Church. In other words, He conveys Himself to us under the forms of bread and wine.

Lastly, we must notice the few words of explanation attributed to our Lord by S. John. They are so brief that we can have little doubt that they represent our Lord's final words on this subject in a very condensed form. But even as we have them, they show how He met the two great difficulties which His disciples felt. He first dealt with the reluctance which they felt in believing that He came down out of heaven, by asking, 'What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where he was before?' These words mean that the Ascension would prove that heaven was His true home from whence He came; and they also hint that after the Ascension it will be quite impossible for the disciples to suppose that He had intended that they should feed on His flesh and

blood in a material manner—an idea which would be almost more odious to the Jewish mind than to our own. The argument then concludes with the statement, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.' Jesus lifts their minds to a region where there could be no danger of degraded and carnal misconceptions, and asserts that the Spirit quickeneth, *i.e.* giveth life. This and the immediately succeeding words are sometimes interpreted in a manner which would go far towards evacuating the whole of His previous teaching about the supreme value of His flesh. But it is inconceivable that our Lord would have puzzled His disciples by now telling them that it was unnecessary for them to feed upon His manhood, and that they only required the help of the Holy Spirit, who was not once mentioned in His foregoing discourse. The clue to the verse is to be found in the explanation that the word 'Spirit' means His own divine Person, as it means in 1 *Corinthians* xv. 45, and probably in *Romans* i. 4 and 2 *Corinthians* iii. 18. This use of the word 'Spirit' survived for a long time in early Christian literature, and has led to some strange mistakes on the part of modern students of early Christian doctrine. Comparing this verse with the strikingly similar expression in 1 *Corinthians* xv. 45, we see its meaning to be that, whereas mere flesh would profit nothing, Christ's flesh or manhood is in vital union with His Divinity, and by that Divinity its power will be grafted into the souls of Christian believers. Thus the whole Christ, and not His separated body and blood, though they were first to be separated, becomes the living bread to each Christian. As a final protest against a materialising interpretation of His teaching, our Lord says that the words which He has spoken are spirit and are life. He has been speaking of spiritual realities and acts, not of

flesh or of food or of eating, as we ordinarily understand them. But though the spiritual things and acts and processes are expressed in material terms, they are not less actual or less true than material food and physical eating.

In this chapter vi. of S. John's Gospel our Lord, though He does not once actually mention His death, teaches that His death is the consummation of His earthly life, and that faith in His death is the condition of man's salvation. And He also represents the Eucharist as a means of appropriating a union with the divine life which is in His own Person. To avail ourselves of His atoning work we appropriate His essential nature, His atoning self. This is not the place for any lengthy discussion of Eucharistic doctrine, but we must not omit certain facts of Christian experience which bear upon the doctrine of the Atonement. It is a real fact in experience, which can no more be discredited than the apprehension of God's forgiveness or of the influence of the Holy Trinity, that the Christian finds his Saviour as his food in this sacrament. It is not the result of outward surroundings; for it is his privilege not only in some vast cathedral, where he feels lost to men but still found by Jesus among the crowds that beset the brilliant altars, nor only in some simple ancient village church,

> 'where the kneeling hamlet drains
> The chalice of the grapes of God';

for he also finds the Christ of the Eucharist in places where every wall and every ornament grates upon his æsthetic taste. The Zwinglian theory of this sacrament, which teaches that it is only consecrated bread, is the counterpart of, and the advance guard of, the Unitarian theory that Jesus is only a consecrated man. On the other hand, the Eucharistic doctrine of the ancient liturgies agrees with the doctrine expressed

in the ancient Œcumenical Councils with regard to Christ's Person. They are true to the New Testament, and they are true to the influence still exercised by the living Christ. No doctrine can ever be a completely adequate statement of the ways of God or of the human soul, but every system of doctrine demands attention when it is coherent, reasonable, and beneficial. And, although the doctrine of the Eucharist was less formally defined than the doctrine of the Person of Christ during the period when Greek thought was still a potent influence in the Christian Church, enough was written to be of very great utility to those who wish to deepen Christian piety and to heal Christian divisions. The great stream of Christian thought which found in the Eucharist a union between the spiritual and the material, the earthly and the divine, analogous to the union of the two natures in the person of our Lord, is at least as old as the second century; it has the assent of many important ancient writers; it survived the division between Eastern and Western Christendom, and it lasted after the Reformation. It is not a completely perfect analogy, but it is one which seems to have sprung directly out of the teaching of S. John, and it is one which without sacrificing truth points to peace.[1] It cannot well be reconciled with that influential body of Roman Catholic doctrine which holds that transubstantiation involves the annihilation of the 'substance' of bread,[2] the inferior element ceasing to exist at the advent of the spiritual, nor can it be reconciled with opinions which reduce the sacrament to symbols of an absent spiritual reality. But there is a good middle

[1] An important list of authorities, which might well be extended, can be found in Mgr. Pierre Batiffol, *Études de Théologie Positive*, tome ii. (Paris, 1904).

[2] For the question as to how far Roman Catholic theology is bound to the opinion that the substance of bread is annihilated, see Father W. R. Carson, *An Eucharistic Eirenicon* (Longmans, 1902).

path between the doctrine of Bellarmine on the one hand and that of the Protestant Reformers on the other. That the doctrine taught so commonly in ancient writers involves a mystery we need not conceal; but, assuming the truth of the Divinity of our Lord, it does not seem to involve any intellectual difficulty greater than that involved in the transmission of human life and the relation of mind to matter.

The sustaining of the Christian by the spiritual forces of Christ's humanity is further implied by our Lord's final discourses with His disciples recorded by S. John.

The supreme proof of His love is that He lays down His life for His 'friends' (xv. 13), but His death does not mean that He will leave them. The result of the reconciliation between God and man effected by Christ's death and typified by the Ascension (xvi. 10) will be the descent of the Holy Spirit. This Force and Person issuing from the Father did not exist (vii. 39) in the same way until Christ ascended. That is, He did not so exist as to be among men the Agent of the Father and the Son in binding men to the incarnate Son and to one another. This new and deeper union could not take place until the Son was 'glorified' by His ascending the cross and ascending His throne in heaven. S. John does not mean that the Holy Spirit had no existence until the Ascension, for this would be to contradict in a flagrant manner that Old Testament to whose witness he so constantly appeals. But he does mean, and he attributes his meaning to our Lord Himself, that until Christ had laid down His life for mankind, the Father did not send the Spirit in such a manner as would enable men to know their union with the Son (xiv. 20), and form one organic union between themselves (xvii. 21). Our Lord consecrates Himself as a Priest (xvii. 19) for the sake of His disciples; on the night of His betrayal He dedicates Himself to the

Father for a sacrifice in which He is both Priest and Victim. The end of this self-consecration is 'that they also may be consecrated (or sanctified) in truth.' Now this sanctifying influence is the work of the Spirit, who will take of the things of Jesus and declare them to the faithful (xvi. 14), explaining what they could not understand before His death, and guiding them into all truth (xiv. 26; xvi. 13). But the Holy Spirit is to do more than teach; He is to give the faithful an actual life contact with Christ. Their own personality will not be in any way annihilated; there will be no such union between Christ and the Christian as would imply that Christ becomes a sinner and the Christian becomes a god. But nevertheless Christ will return to them in the advent of the Spirit. For a brief space of time the links which have been formed between them will be broken, but they will be replaced by a deeper and more lasting union. 'I will not leave you desolate; I come unto you . . . because I live, ye shall live also.' Therefore the Holy Spirit, although He is 'another Advocate' or 'Defender,' consoling and protecting the faithful as Christ Himself had done, is not a substitute for Christ. He is the Force by which Christ becomes life within the human soul, and by which the believer is identified with Christ as the branch is identified with the vine which lives for and in its branches. Jesus Christ gives Himself to us in and with the Spirit. His life is made available for us because He died for us. The work that He did on Good Friday and the work that He did on Whitsunday are not the same work, but we only appropriate one when we appropriate the other. It is of course true to say that as soon as a man is sure that Christ died to save him, and makes that moral surrender to Christ which the New Testament invariably demands, he is reconciled to God. He is, though a sinner, forgivable and forgiven. This forgiveness is the gift, the un-

deserved gift, of God to man. It is in no sense immoral that the gift should be given, because nothing can or does stimulate a man's dormant moral energy so much as the undeserved loving-kindness which S. John calls 'grace.' But the gift means ruin to the receiver who does not use it. And to use the gift is communion with the Atonement, communion with the atoning Saviour and with His atoning work. Such a communion is made possible by the Holy Spirit. It results in sanctification by the truth, a vital dependence upon Him who is the way to the Father and the truth and the life (xiv. 6). We may sometimes be indignant at the extravagances committed for the sake of religion by the Salvation Army, but in choosing as its motto the words 'Blood and Fire' it has combined in three syllables two truths which cheap religion is continually separating. All earnest, active men wish for fire, the power to spread warmth and the contagion of ideals, and, if necessary, the power to burn and destroy. But their work is destitute of 'the fruits of the Spirit,' and like all merely natural enthusiasm is apt to scorch the finer qualities of their souls unless, sooner or later, they realise what they owe to Christ. It is not enough that they should at one point or many points try to imitate Christ. Circumstances make a literal imitation impossible. Christ's own commands are so worded that they seem purposely to suggest that a literal following is not sufficient; and the attempt to find Christ imitable, if it be not combined with that identification which He Himself inculcated, will result in the discovery that Christ's example is unapproachable. But to learn that He identified Himself with us in dying for us lays a really secure foundation for our identification with Him as living for us. His death brings home to us the truth that we have failed to do God's will—in other words, that we have sinned. And it is through the knowledge of this failure and its remedy that we

become fitted for the real fire, which is not a mere contagion of enthusiasm but a distinctive power in each soul.

The divine Logos incarnate is the medium and the principle of objective revelation and reconciliation. But the Spirit fulfils the work of the Logos by acting as the principle of our comprehension and appropriation of the great things that Christ has done. And this Spirit is Christ's. 'The same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit' was the express witness of S. John the Baptist at the beginning of this Gospel, and the Gospel does not end until the disciples had been trained to understand the meaning of Pentecost. They became deeply conscious of a Power that came to dwell within them, guiding their minds and their hearts, revealing their weakness and removing it. They knew that the Spirit gave them the power to respond to the call of the Good Shepherd who had laid down His life for the sheep, so that in working out their own salvation, in living the life of 'a new creation,' they still owed all that new self to God. The 'Giver of Life' must be 'Lord' and 'God' no less than the Son. In other words, the apostles, though they did not employ the word 'Trinity,' believed in the Trinity. It will usually be found that where men retain a vague respect for Christianity, but have repudiated the doctrine of the Trinity, they hold one of three conceptions of God. Either while denying the Divinity of our Lord they still continue to interpret God more or less anthropomorphically through their conception of Jesus; or they regard God as a law of duty, a 'categorical imperative' within their own souls; or they look upon God as a more or less unknowable Force and Cause. There is some truth in each of these three conceptions; they are respectively some tribute to the Son, the Spirit, and the Father. But they all tend in the direction either of Agnosticism, or of a refined obscurantism which is

content to propagate righteousness while ignoring the connexion which must exist between true thought and true action. But the healthy human mind will ask not only 'What is truth?' but also 'What is the relation between truth and moral experience?' The Christian sees in Jesus Christ God's eternal purpose for man realised, and God's eternal attitude towards man made evident. And what the Christian sees, he comes in S. John's language to 'know,' through a fellowship with the Holy Spirit. He enters into that moral life of sonship which is God's eternal purpose for him. This is what our Lord Himself calls 'knowing the truth,' and those who know it are morally 'free'; they are like Jesus because His Spirit has changed and penetrated their own spirits. And the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, instead of being an encumbrance to religious thought, is simply an outward expression of a reality without which the Christian life would be inconceivable. Man is capable of knowing God, and God is capable of being known by man, because He is both One and Three.

§ 2. *S. John's First Epistle.*

The contrast and the similarity between the Gospel according to S. John and his first Epistle strongly confirm the tradition concerning their authorship. In the Epistle, which is one of the earliest attested books of the New Testament, we are able to see how the author adds reflections of his own to the teaching of His Master, or deduces from it conceptions which are intended for the instruction of his converts. Thus 'God so loved the world' inspires him with the thought that 'God is love,' and 'I am the light of the world' with 'God is light.' In the same way, the connexion between the death of Christ and the sin of man

is stated in a manner which differentiates the Epistle from the Gospel. In the Gospel the death of Christ is the highest revelation of divine love, but in the Epistle it is also above all things the fact without which sin cannot be neutralised. The apostle insists upon the historical truth of the atoning work of Christ and upon existing witness to that work: 'This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one' (v. 6, 8). It is evident that the apostle is alluding to the miserable parody of Christianity which became so popular in the second century, and which partially survives to-day in the Moslem conception of Christ, viz. the doctrine that Jesus was a mere man upon whom a divine power descended at His baptism, and from whom that power departed before He suffered the ignominy of the crucifixion. The apostle declares that the crucifixion was as true an experience of the Saviour as His baptism. He who by His baptism associated Himself with repentant sinners, by His death truly endured a Passion for which that baptism was the preliminary act. And the witness to these two saving events is with us. The Holy Spirit makes them penetrate our spiritual experience, and the testimony of the Spirit is corroborated by the existence of the water of Christian baptism and the blood of the Eucharistic cup. The testimony of the three is one. They all teach that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, who gives us life, and teach us at what a cost to Him that life has become ours.

Personal salvation consists in our appropriation of life, and freedom from sin and the possession of life are practically identical, for life expels sin. Thus, God is said to have sent His Son into the world 'that we

might live through him'; and the apostle immediately adds: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (iv. 9, 10). Jesus Christ is our propitiation, and we are further told that, 'If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (ii. 1, 2); and again, 'the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (i. 7). That is to say, the death of Jesus Christ has a direct relation to the sins of the whole world, to His own righteousness, and to His present intercession for man. To be a 'propitiation' for sins means primarily to annul or obliterate sins by sacrifice; to be 'the righteous' in this special and supreme manner means that only One who was perfectly righteous could, in becoming a propitiation, establish God's law of righteousness; and to be an 'Advocate' means that He intercedes for man's forgiveness by virtue of the death which has been endured. The world gains pardon through the death of Jesus Christ. In one sense we may say that the world was pardoned when Jesus died. For by this reparation to God's holiness and revelation of His love, peace was then made between God and the human race. But in another sense the pardon and the propitiation had only begun to take effect, as men, one by one, accepted them.

A new situation was created when Jesus died, but it is useless to the individual sinner until he enters into it. Precisely as in the teaching of S. Paul, we find that a continuous surrender to the propitiatory power of Christ is essential to the Christian life. The Christian is not primarily forgiven because he has become holy and 'cleansed'; he is forgiven because he trusts God revealed to him in Christ, but he does not continue in a forgiven condition unless he strives to be holy. 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light,

we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin. . . . If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (i. 7, 9). The Christian needs a continuous purification, and he must make a continuous moral effort; he must 'walk.' If he does not exert himself, he not only does not grow in sanctification; he loses any advantage which he may at first have derived from the work of Christ. For the apostle's words obviously imply that the Christian is unforgiven and uncleansed unless the moral life continues. Again, like S. Paul, who teaches that the Christian is 'dead to sin' and nevertheless still has to mortify or 'make dead' his lower affections, S. John alternately tells us what the divine principle of life given to man really involves, and what human weakness no less certainly involves. 'Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God' (iii. 9). That is the ideal, and it is not a mere external ideal. It is involved in the new birth given in the baptism received by faith. The power is in the Christian if he will only utilise it. Yet the Christian sins, and must confess his sins. He approaches to actual sinlessness in so far as he abides in Christ (iii. 6). For he cannot really overcome sin until the principle of life within him has become a principle of love; and this is to grow like God, who is both 'love' and 'eternal life' (iv. 16; v. 20).

'We love (him) because he first loved us,' and 'Jesus having loved his own which were in the world, loved them unto the end.' It is by the deep simplicity of such words as these that S. John has appealed to the heart of generations. It needs little experience to discover how his writings fascinate the poor and unlearned as well as the thoughtful minds who have not been made dizzy by strong argument. The simple and

the clever alike are conscious of meeting a tide of love which crosses all the banks and bars of their ignorance or their acuteness. And they often answer love with love. It may sometimes be an unreasoning love, but even this possesses great power and a wisdom of its own. But it may rise to an intellectual energy which loves God with 'all the mind' as well as with 'all the heart.' And in such cases it draws nearest to the spirit of S. John, who found in Jesus both the perfect Friend and that Word who is the light of the world. The details of the life and of the Passion of Christ were more precious to him as he learned to see all those human experiences and sorrows from God's point of view. In his eyes they grew in meaning and in human completeness and pathos when they were contemplated as the actions and the sufferings of the Everlasting.

Such a love of Jesus, as the constant Companion of the soul, has for centuries inspired the Christianity of northern Europe in a remarkable degree. From the time of S. Bernard, in whom the chivalry and the theology of the twelfth century came to flower, it has grown and stretched out its branches. Modern readers are sometimes apt to become somewhat impatient when they find medieval theologians speaking in crabbed phrases of the 'superabundant satisfaction' paid by our Lord to the Father for the debt incurred by human sins, and outweighing the gravity of those sins by the infinite value which His human acts derived from their association with His divine nature. Yet that school of theology was in principle right, and their clever critic Duns Scotus, the brilliant Franciscan friar, was wrong. The keynote to the story of the Passion must ultimately be found in the answer which is given to the question, 'Who was the Sufferer?' The fulness with which all the evangelists narrate the events of the Passion, each outrage upon justice and

pity, is due to the fact that they knew Him to be the Son of God, and felt, as S. Paul felt, 'He loved me and gave himself up for me.' And here the later medieval piety found itself at home. The teaching of men like Eckhardt and Thomas à Kempis will not become obsolete any more than the best poetry ever becomes obsolete. Great poetry continues to live not by virtue of its sound but of its reality. And a personal experience of the love of Christ is real, and no true expression of it can permanently die. Our late medieval English churches and English prayers, whether in the vernacular or in Latin, are often fine interpretations of the message of S. John. One of us may have seen a grey porch with a worn carving of the Heart of Jesus; another a tattered banner with shields bearing pictures of the five wounds of Christ; many of us have worshipped in church after church adorned with the crown of thorns, and other emblems of the Passion. They have told us something of what the love of Jesus and the worship of Jesus were to our forefathers. And we shall learn still more if we read the prayers which have so generally and unwisely been allowed to fall into disuse, and which show so well that it is possible to be tender without ceasing to be manly. And that surely is one of the lessons which S. John learned from the Atonement. Long before it became popular on the Continent or found a way into the Roman Calendar, the great festival of 'The Most Sweet Name Jesu' was authorised in the Church of England. The festival was an outward token of the way in which the sober English spirit burned with a fire of devotion towards the incarnate Son of God, and expressed it with the exuberant splendour of northern ceremonial. And that this devotion was not a mere matter of outward show may be gathered from the following extract from one of the remaining ancient English prayers to Jesus Christ:

'I love Thee with all mine heart, with all my mind, and with all my might; and nothing so much in earth, nor above the earth as I do Thee, my sweet Lord, Christ Jesu.

'And, for that I have not loved Thee nor worshipped Thee above all things, as my Lord, my God, and my Saviour, Christ Jesu:

'I beseech Thee, with meekness and contrite heart, for mercy and for forgiveness of my great unkindness, for the great love that Thou shewedst for me and all mankind, what time Thou offeredst Thy glorious body, God and Man, unto the cross, there to be crucified and wounded; and unto Thy glorious heart a sharp spear, whence ran out plenteously blood and water for the redemption and salvation of me and all mankind.

'And thus having remembrance stedfastly in my heart, Christ Jesu:

'I doubt not but that Thou wilt be full nigh me, and comfort me both bodily and ghostly with Thy glorious presence; And at the last bring me unto Thine everlasting bliss, the which shall never have end. Amen.'[1]

§ 3. *The Revelation.*

The *Revelation of S. John* has during the last few years been the subject of most minute investigation, and we can reasonably believe that the investigation is being rewarded by the attainment of solid results. Among the results we can tentatively include the following. The book was probably mainly written in A.D. 68 or 69, during the reign of Galba, or the beginning of that of Vespasian. It dates from a period just after the death of Nero, whose name, and rank of Caesar, are most probably signified in Jewish fashion under the number 666. That the last convulsions of the Jewish theocracy and Jerusalem are at hand is

[1] *Processional of the Nuns of Chester*, p. 29, Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. xviii.

shown in chapter xi., where the miserable city is compared with Sodom, as in Jewish prophecy. The author throughout his visions uses the language of the Old Testament and of Jewish apocalyptic literature, *e.g.* in giving the name of days to years preceding a catastrophe. And his whole tracing of the end of all things and the struggle between Christ and Satan is strongly influenced by the eschatology of later Judaism. We find the clearest conceptions of specifically Christian doctrines based on actual personal experience, and side by side with them descriptions of the future which are developed on strongly Jewish and traditional lines. The nearest parallel which can be found to this combination is probably that afforded by the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. In both books there is a mass of symbols and symbolic actions which has long been covered by a torrent of different interpretations. In both it is sometimes extraordinarily difficult for the reader to tell how far an event or a personage is conceived of as historical or symbolical, or both. In both there seems to be a free use of older materials, which are modified and even transformed by the mind which has made them part of a new and greater construction. For behind the *Divina Commedia* are the writings of medieval mystics and schoolmen, pagan mythology and Christian legend. And behind the Revelation there are the works of the Jewish prophets, possibly also written Jewish apocalypses, and possibly even the outward form of a pagan story concerning the creation. Neither the one book nor the other has escaped the criticism of the *advocatus diaboli.* And yet, if we can truly say that there are passages in Dante's work which have been plundered and imitated but never equalled, we can say with greater truth that there are pictures in this short Revelation more magnificent and moving than any other pictures painted to encourage the persecuted and despondent.

No one can read the Revelation, even in the most haphazard fashion, without noticing how central and dominating is the position assigned to Jesus. The book is extraordinarily rich in the descriptions of His glory, dignity, and authority. The fire of His eyes, the voice like that of many waters, the stars in His hand, and the long priestly robe and golden girdle, are the attributes of One who is the Lord of nature and of grace. There is no detailed and continuous exposition of the doctrine of His Person. With far truer art and deeper effect one feature of His nature and one characteristic of His work is added after another until the book closes. The majesty of the Child of Mary, who is also the Child of faithful Israel, of whom Mary is the type, is then left in our minds as the majesty of unique power and unique pathos. Jesus 'the Christ' is 'ruler of the kings of the earth' (i. 5), and 'Lord of lords' (xvii. 14). He is 'one like unto a son of man,' like the personification of the reigning Messianic race in *Daniel* vii. 13 (i. 13). His authority extends to all nations (xii. 5). He will return to judge the world (xiv. 14-16; xxii. 20). Further than this, He receives divine honours and praises as profound as those which are rendered to the Father. To Him is given the blessing of the innumerable host of the redeemed (v. 12), the elders who bear the bowls of incense fall down before Him (v. 8), angels who refuse worship for themselves (xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9) join in worshipping God and the Lamb. He holds the keys of death and of Hades (i. 18), determining who shall enter and who shall leave the unseen world. Jesus is not a man who became exalted to a divine rank which He did not always possess. He is carefully described from the first in language similar to, or identical with, the Old Testament titles of Jehovah. He is 'the first and the last, and the Living One' (i. 17, 18). He is 'the Alpha and the Omega' (xxii. 13). He is 'the ancient of days' (i. 14). He is the 'Word of

God' as in the fourth Gospel. He calls God 'Father' in a unique sense (i. 6; iii. 5; xiv. 1). He possesses the secret of God and writes His own name and His Father's upon the foreheads of the saints (ii. 17; iii. 12; xiv. 1). Like Jehovah, He receives a 'new name,' which only He himself knows (xix. 12), but which He will impart to those who overcome (ii. 17; iii. 12). And in His hand He holds the seven spirits of God (ii. 1; v. 6), which signify the omnipresence and omnipotence of the Creator.

The death of One so essentially divine, so fully victorious over every hostile and evil force, cannot have the same meaning as the death of any saint or prophet. And from the beginning of his book S. John shows how deeply conscious he is of the part played by the death of Christ in the history of the world. Immediately after the title of the book, and as soon as he begins his address to the seven Churches of Asia whose spiritual condition forms the historical occasion of the vision, there is a doxology interwoven with a summary of Christ's redeeming work, 'unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father' (i. 5, 6). The Son, who here as in the Gospel is divine but at the same time subordinate to the Father, is One who always loves us, but did at a definite past time liberate us by His blood. There is an important various reading, 'washed us by his blood.' This might naturally be taken as a reference to the moment of Christian baptism, when the members of the Churches here addressed appropriated Christ's saving work. But whether the passage does or does not contain a reference to baptism, it refers to Christ's blood as the means of our salvation. Whether we think of Him as washing us from sin, or liberating us from sin by the giving of a ransom, Christ by His blood shed at His death rescued us from sin. And the result is

that we, over whom God did not reign formerly, are admitted to citizenship in His kingdom. We are more than citizens, we are all priests. Whatever functions may have been intrusted by Christ to the officials whom He has appointed to be 'stewards' of His household, there is a priesthood belonging to all the baptized. Christ appoints some to be the mouthpieces and representatives of that priesthood, but this must not be taken to imply that a sacerdotal position does not belong to all, as indeed it belonged to all Israelites under the old dispensation (*Exodus* xix. 6; cf. *Isaiah* lxi. 6). Among many unnecessary mutilations of our worship in the sixteenth century, we in England have to regret the disappearance of the sentence in which the medieval priest at Mass emphasised this truth by saying, 'Pray, brethren and sisters, for me, that this our common sacrifice may be accepted by the Lord our God.' Great medieval writers, and before them great fathers of the Church such as S. Leo and S. Augustine, speak in the strongest manner of a sacerdotal position as belonging to the laity by virtue of their baptism.[1] They seem never to have imagined that a clear recognition of an official hierarchy holding an authoritative commission from Christ militates against the priesthood of the whole Church won by the death of Jesus. We are a worshipping, sacrificing people, because that death won for us a new direct access to the Father, an access which was given to us by God granting His children a full forgiveness.

But the most characteristic teaching about the Atonement is that which is found in connexion with the designation of our Lord as 'the Lamb' of God. The title of 'Lamb of God' occurs in the Gospel, though the Greek word which is there employed is replaced in the Revelation by another word which forms a more exact

[1] For ancient teaching on this subject see Dr. Charles Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 78 ff.

counterpart to the 'beast,' which is the Roman emperor as the object and centre of Roman idolatry. In the Gospel the Baptist, on seeing the Messiah, exclaims, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away (or beareth) the sin of the world!' It has been objected that it is psychologically impossible that the Baptist should have spoken in this manner, just as it has also been objected that he could not have so definitely confessed the divine Sonship of Christ at His baptism. But these objections seem to assume that this great prophet had no spiritual conceptions except those which were common to the ordinary Jews of the period. The ordinary Jew was not at all likely to confess so quickly either that Jesus was 'the Son of God' or 'the Lamb of God.' But it is by no means probable that those who had really imbibed the spirit of the ancient prophets would fail to transcend the limitations of contemporary Jewish belief. Apart from anything else, the Book of Isaiah furnished the devoted and intelligent Hebrew with ample reason for ascribing divine attributes to the Messiah, and for believing in the atoning character of the death of the perfect Servant of Jehovah. Even if the Baptist's faith was afterwards for a while shaken, as it appears to have been (*S. Matthew* xi. 3), why should he not have believed, as many Jewish sages believed, that the suffering Servant was the Messiah, and in one great moment of intuition have realised that Jesus was both the Son of God and the suffering Servant? This intuition was itself the fruit of revelation. But revelation comes to those who have an intense longing for the fulfilment of an ideal. And it was this longing which the Baptist shared with men such as the poet who wrote *Psalm* xxii. and the poet-prophet who wrote *Isaiah* liii.

S. John also had his revelation, and in it he sees Jesus as the Lamb. The Baptist called Him 'the Lamb of God,' because God provided Him as a sacrifice; but S. John speaks of Him simply as 'the Lamb,' the

symbol of obedient and sacrificed love. The name occurs twenty-nine times. The most important texts are as follows: (i) *Revelation* v. 6 ff. The prophet is bidden to behold the victorious *Lion*, the Messiah, who can unlock the secrets of the future, and 'I saw in the midst of the throne . . . a *Lamb* standing, as though it had been slain.' On the very throne where in the immediately preceding vision the seer had beheld the eternal God adored by representatives of the Church and of the powers of nature, he now sees the same adoration paid to the sacrificed but now standing and victorious Lamb. He is not dead, but He has died, and He is sovereign because He died. And in the 'new song' which His worshippers sing in His praise, the cost of His sacrifice, as well as the effect, is celebrated. 'Thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue.' There could be no stronger assertion of the writer's conviction that the very heart of God's sovereignty over the human race is the divine love which was shown in the death of a divine Being. The death of Christ is not only the supreme revelation of God's action towards sinners, it is the expression in time of a law of God's nature which is eternal and changeless. The blood of Christ is here regarded as a ransom-price. (ii) *Revelation* vii. is an episode before the opening of the seventh 'seal' or decree of the will of God. It is a picture of the abode of the blessed, the Church triumphant, introduced to console the Church militant in the midst of her tribulation. Out of this great tribulation there has come a multitude of those who have 'washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' Arrayed in white and bearing palms, these are those who have suffered for Christ. As the blood of Christ makes priests, so it makes martyrs and confessors. The Lamb also suffered martyrdom, and yet His death had a power far beyond theirs. When S. John says that they had washed their robes in His

blood he must mean that the martyrs owed their purity to Jesus only. He is far more than a great example; He has in some way none the less certain because here undefined, procured for them freedom from sin. That even the virgins who follow the Lamb in heaven only reach heaven because Christ died for them, is shown in *Revelation* xiv. 3, 4, where they are twice said to have been 'purchased.' We may notice, too, that whereas S. John has previously said that Christ loosed (or washed) us, he here mentions an action on the side of the redeemed corresponding with the action of the Redeemer. They are not mere passive recipients of the divine forgiveness. The martyrs themselves wash their robes, deliberately availing themselves of the fountain which is the blood once shed. The blood of Christ is here regarded as the source of purity. (iii) *Revelation* xii. 11 teaches us another aspect of the atoning blood. It is the source of moral victory under cruel pressure. This chapter is the centre of the book. It is a picture of the Incarnation of the Son of God and the deadly conflict which ensues between Michael with his angels, on the one hand, and Satan with his angels on the other. Satan is figured in the world-power of Rome. Corresponding with the city on the seven hills is the dragon with seven heads which persecutes 'the brethren.' But 'they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony; and they loved not their life even unto death.' The reference is probably to the hideous persecution of the Christians under Nero, which inaugurated a systematic attempt to exterminate Christianity by punishing Christians simply because they were Christians. The Church survived this tribulation, though men and women were thrown to the beasts in the arena, or burnt like giant torches to illuminate Nero's gardens. Even if the confessors of Christ did not die, they were willing to die. And S. John traces their power to the blood of the Lamb

and the word of their testimony. There would have been no such testimony had it not been for the blood of the Lamb. It is quite possible that the old tradition to the effect that the apostle himself was plunged into boiling oil outside the Latin Gate at Rome is at any rate partly true. It is conceivable that it was intended to burn him alive; that oil, though not boiling oil, was used to prepare his body for burning, as in the case of others, and that this punishment was commuted for banishment. But whether he himself came so near to death or not, he must have known a multitude who overcame the world-power 'because of the blood of the Lamb.' Of them, and of all those who refuse to worship 'the beast'—that is, the Roman emperor in his claim to the honours of divine worship—he says that their names have been 'written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain' (*Revelation* xiii. 8; cf. xxi. 27). From the creation of the world they were foreseen and known by Him, who knew that He would die for them, and knew that they would love Him in return better than life itself. And it is such who at the last will enter into the city which has no sun, 'for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb.'

From the beginning to the end the Apocalypse is a holy pageant, a procession in honour of the precious blood.

CHAPTER VI

PRIMITIVE JEWISH CHRISTIAN TEACHING

The term 'Jewish Christian' is necessarily somewhat ambiguous. It is sometimes applied to various sects of Hebrew blood and Aramaic speech which are known to have existed in and after the second century. Some of these sects were scarcely Christian in any sense of the word, and all except the 'Nazarenes' had repudiated apostolic Christianity. They anticipated in its most important features the religion of Muhammad, who almost certainly derived his theology from this source. Important as these small sects have been for the religious history of the world, they contribute almost nothing to our knowledge of the first Jewish Christians; and, on the other hand, the apostle whose teaching they most openly flouted, S. Paul, 'the apostle of the Gentiles,' was himself a Jew profoundly influenced by the traditions of his people. His polemic against Pharisaism has almost made the world forget that he thought as a Jew and argued as a Jew to the tragic end of his great Christian career. We must therefore be very cautious in applying the term 'Jewish Christian' to any type of theology, simply for the reason that it does not bear the plain impress of the doctrines which S. Paul specially advocated. And yet the term is convenient. There was a period in the history of the Church when most of its members did

not believe that there need be any divorce between Christianity and the Mosaic Law. The first Christians at Jerusalem frequented the Temple, they observed the distinction between clean and unclean food, they avoided all contact with any person who was ceremonially defiled. It is extremely probable that for some time they circumcised their children, and a statement which unquestionably comes from an actual companion of S. Paul shows that many were indignant when that apostle was reported to be teaching the Jews settled among a Gentile population 'to forsake Moses,'—that is, the Jewish ceremonial customs (*Acts* xxi. 21). We need not suppose that S. Paul had done anything of the kind. The dilemma which S. Paul formulated was not 'You must forsake either Jesus or the Law,' but 'You must seek salvation either through Jesus or through the Law.' It was not his aim to prevent Jewish Christians from observing their ancient ceremonies so long as they did not attach an exaggerated importance to them. He was content to maintain at all hazards that the observance of these ceremonies made no difference to a man's status in the eyes of God, and also that the whole work of Christ was undermined if a *Gentile* had to become both a Jew and a Christian. To teach that the Gentile must become both a Jew and a Christian was to teach that there were two co-ordinate sources of salvation, Christ and the Law; whereas Christ is the sole source of salvation, and His Gospel contains everything of permanent value which the Law taught.

Now the Church saw from the first that Christ is the only source of salvation (*Acts* iv. 12). It is also plain that S. Peter, and probably the whole Church, understood that the promise of salvation was to be fulfilled to 'all that are afar off' as well as to the Jewish nation. But the whole Church did not see clearly that the forms of the Jewish religion need not

be preserved, and that the Gentiles ought not to be required to keep the ceremonial of the Law. If we are correct in believing that our Lord was crucified in A.D. 29, then it was not until nineteen years later that the decisive victory was won and the Council at Jerusalem decided that the Gentile converts to Christianity need not be circumcised. Whatever critical difficulties remain in connexion with certain parts of *Acts*, the book absolutely carries conviction along the whole outline of the story. The manner in which the infant Church threw off its swathing bands one by one, and gradually moved step by step to meet the Gentile world, is as slow as it is unfaltering. It has all the air of ecclesiastical history as opposed to fictitious hagiography. And to the theology of this period of nineteen years we may fitly apply the name of primitive Jewish Christian teaching.

Other books of the New Testament also show teaching of an emphatically primitive and Jewish type. These are the *Epistles of S. James*, *S. Jude*, and *S. Peter*. The book of *The Revelation of S. John*, which bears a strongly Jewish colour of another type, has already been described, and will not be quoted in this chapter. Much discussion still continues with regard to the authorship of the above-mentioned Epistles. In some cases the internal evidence, in some the external, in some a combination of both, is weighty. Of the Epistles it is fortunate that the most important, the first bearing the name of S. Peter, has most to be said in its favour. The evidence is exceptionally strong, and there is no probability of its being overthrown. In the case of the *Epistle of S. James* the external evidence is weak, the evidence of the Epistle itself very strong. The fact that these two writers should have written in Greek ought not to be a barrier in the way of accepting their Epistles. Modern Englishmen, being very indifferent linguists,

are apt to forget what a very large proportion of mankind is able to converse readily in two languages. At the present time there are numbers of men in the Balkans and in Syria who speak Greek in addition to some other native language. And there is every probability in favour of several of the apostles having had a more than tolerable acquaintance with both Greek and Aramaic. The genuineness of the *Epistle of S. Jude* need not be disputed. It was written when some of the apostles were already dead, but when their teaching was still remembered by the people to whom the Epistle is addressed (ver. 18). This fact compels us to say either that the Epistle is of a somewhat early date, or that it is a deliberate forgery. And the comparative obscurity of the teacher whose authorship the letter claims is fatal to the hypothesis of a forgery. The authenticity of the *Second Epistle of S. Peter* is much more difficult to maintain, especially in view of its apparent literary dependence upon that of S. Jude. If, on the other hand, this Epistle has really been copied by the less-known Jude, its genuineness at once becomes likely. The door ought not to be closed against this possibility, but it must be granted that at present external evidence is rather hostile.

The book of *Acts* is unquestionably by the author of the third Gospel, and this writer must have been a companion of S. Paul. The Greek words and phrases which are employed show that the whole book is by the writer who composed certain sections in which the pronoun 'we' occurs, and the person who thus speaks of himself and S. Paul can only have been S. Luke. The book forms an artistic unity. It is extremely likely that the author, who used both written and oral sources in composing his Gospel, employed a similar method in writing his 'second treatise.' Hitherto, however, no attempt to discover the written sources which he may have copied has proved at all successful.

The different efforts made in this direction have attained no harmony, and are sufficiently contradictory to refute each other. All that we can say is that the earlier chapters of the book do differ somewhat in style from the later chapters. They are more Hebraic in character, just as some chapters in the Gospel are more Hebraic than others. Consequently, some early Jewish Christian source seems to have been under the writer's eyes and to have affected his style—a style which nevertheless retains a general uniformity.

This change in style corresponds with change of moral and spiritual atmosphere. Bishop Lightfoot well expressed it thus: 'As we pass from the beginning to the end of the book we find that the religious climate, so to speak, is quite changed, and we are breathing a different air. In short, we have passed from the Hebraic to the Hellenic. This change manifests itself throughout, in the speeches and in the actions, in the modes of feeling and in the local customs and institutions. Yet the transition is not sudden. It is a gradual growth, as the Church emancipates itself, both locally and morally, from the tutelage of its Hebrew infancy. Between the two extremes the intermediate Hellenistic territory is duly traversed.'[1]

The distinctively Hebraic part of *Acts* is the account of the Church in Jerusalem, concluding with the death of Stephen and the persecution of the Church (viii. 3). From viii. 4 to xiii. 3 we have an account of the Church in Judaea and Samaria and then in Antioch, concluding with the sending of Barnabas and Saul from Antioch as missionaries. Before this great forward step is recorded, there are various fragmentary notices which tell us of events which inevitably led to the great result of carrying the Gospel to the Gentile world, but which no one could have foreseen or devised.

[1] Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (second edition), article 'Acts.'

These notices are inconceivable except as accounts of events which actually occurred. For instance, no one acquainted with the methods of ecclesiastical forgers would regard the story of the murmuring of the Hellenistic widows as a fiction of hagiography. Yet this feminine discontent is a link in a little chain of events which has altered the history of the world. The development of these events is narrated in a manner which has all the appearance of probability. And the speeches contained in it fit the story. We need not consider it a point of honour to maintain that there are no difficulties and stumbling-blocks. And with regard to the speeches in particular, we cannot for a moment deny that the author gave them their final form. But they are much too varied and lifelike, and too appropriate for their special occasions, to be treated as his own rhetorical exercises. They are probably derived from actual notes of the speeches, and adequately represent the type of address given by the leading apostles to their hearers during the earliest period of Church history.

The doctrine of Christ's Person in the earlier part of *Acts* is what we should expect from men who had lived with Jesus, and had diligently studied the writings of the prophets. From the first He is *the Lord Jesus* (i. 6, 21). At Pentecost S. Peter proclaims Him as *Jesus of Nazareth, approved of God by mighty works, and wonders and signs*. He strongly asserts His Lordship and Messiahship, and concludes by saying that 'God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (ii. 36). In the next address He is *the Servant of God, the holy* and *righteous One, i.e.* the fulfiller of the law; *the Prince of life*, and *Saviour*, the *Prophet* like unto Moses, *i.e.* the revealer of God's will; and the *Seed of Abraham, i.e.* a Father and source of blessing to a new Israel. Before the Sanhedrin S. Peter declares Him to be *the*

Stone, or foundation of God's temple, and speaks of Him as now exalted to be the *Head of the corner*, connecting the walls of the temple or Church (iv. 11). S. Stephen describes Him as the *Son of Man* (vii. 56), S. Philip sees in Jesus *the Lamb* led to the slaughter (viii. 32). These and similar passages, if isolated from their context, might be interpreted as implying that the apostles only regarded Jesus as a highly gifted human Messiah. With the probable exception of the title *Lord*, they do not by themselves suggest that He is by nature divine. It has even been urged that the first half of the book shows that the disciples did not consider that Jesus became the Messiah until He was raised from the dead and exalted by God to heaven. But there is really no passage in *Acts* which goes beyond the statement of S. Paul in *Romans* i. 4, that Jesus Christ was 'declared to be the Son of God with power' by His resurrection. When S. Peter, having spoken of the resurrection and ascension, says, 'God hath made him both Lord and Christ' (ii. 36), he does not mean that the Messianic work of Jesus began at His resurrection, for this would contradict his teaching about the death of Christ (*e.g.* in iii. 8). S. Peter's words imply that it was after the resurrection that God gave to His Son a Messianic lordship over the Church. Again, when the author of *Acts* records S. Paul's speech at Antioch, he does not mean, as is sometimes suggested, that S. Paul believed that Jesus became the Son of God when He, God, 'raised Him up' (xiii. 33). The term 'raising up' includes both our Lord's birth in the world and His resurrection, both of which events were necessary if 'the promise made unto the fathers' was to be fulfilled. This interpretation is confirmed by S. Paul's quotation, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' S. Paul surely does not mean that the term 'begotten' can be applied in a literal sense to any point in the human life of Christ. He

means that Christ was introduced into the world as a new spiritual force, first as the divine-human Son, and then, at the resurrection, as possessing an immortal human nature which can influence His 'many brethren.'

But it is when we turn from the explicit to the more indirect statements about the Person of our Lord that we see that nothing short of Divinity really embraces the various powers which are attributed to Christ. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether the author in using the word 'Lord' is speaking of the Father or of the Son, the very ambiguity being a strong argument for the view which is here maintained. If God is Lord of heaven and earth, Jesus is *Lord of all* (x. 36). It is asserted that there is salvation *in none other* (iv. 12). His 'Name' or Person is directly stated to have restored a lame man to soundness in answer to *faith in His Name* (iii. 16). It is indeed very remarkable that though Christ was no longer visibly present, miracles are regarded as the work of Christ Himself.[1] This corresponds with the fact that He is believed to be actually preparing for the full realisation of His Kingdom. It is Christ who has poured out (ii. 33) the Holy Spirit, 'the Spirit of the Lord,' to fit the disciples for the 'Day of the Lord' (ii. 20), when His Kingdom will be shown and vindicated. Such statements, and the prayer directed to Christ by the dying Stephen, prepare us for the assertion of Saul, that Jesus is the *Son of God* (ix. 20). This title does not occur at the beginning of the book, but the wholly exceptional relation which it signifies is implied by the expression 'the Father,' which occurs even in the first two chapters (i. 4, 7; ii. 33).

In *Acts* the powers of Jesus are therefore essentially divine, and such as no devout Jew could attribute to an exalted man. His death and resurrection are vitally related to His exercise of those powers for

[1] iii. 6; iv. 30; ix. 17, 34.

the renewal of man's spiritual life. It is quite true that statements about His death, and explanations of its meaning, are not so full as in many other parts of the New Testament. And in considering this fact we must be careful not to conclude too hastily either that the apostles at first failed to realise the importance of Christ's death, and sought to apologise for it, or that they understood it as deeply as they did after twenty or thirty years of experience in working out their own salvation and converting others. The important place of the death of our Lord in the theology of the most primitive period of the Church's history is shown by the identification of Jesus the Messiah with the suffering Servant of the Lord described by Isaiah. 'The God of our fathers,' says S. Peter, 'hath glorified his Servant Jesus' (iii. 13). And 'Of a truth in this city against thy holy Servant Jesus whom thou didst anoint (*i.e.* as Messiah), both Herod and Pontius Pilate . . . were gathered together' (iv. 27). When Philip meets the Ethiopian eunuch he finds that he is reading the fifty-third chapter of *Isaiah*, where the description of the Servant's vicarious death and ultimate victory is contained. The eunuch doubts who this Servant can be, and Philip explains to him that it is Jesus (viii. 35). This was not a theory invented by the apostles. The voice heard by our Lord at His baptism asserted that He was the Servant in whom the Father is 'well pleased' (see above, p. 98). Our Lord's description of His mission as that of one who came 'to minister and to give his life a ransom for many,' and His own appropriation of the saying, 'He was reckoned with transgressors' (*S. Luke* xxii. 37 from *Isaiah* liii. 12) imply that He was clearly conscious of being the 'Servant of the Lord.' The truth that this Sufferer is identical with the Messiah has been vehemently opposed by many Jewish commentators, especially of later times. Their method

of treating this passage, *Isaiah* lii., liii., is not isolated, for it has a parallel in the later Jewish treatment of the great Immanuel prophecies in chapters vii., viii., ix. The 'sign' which the prophet there offers to King Ahaz is a Messiah to whom in the most explicit fashion the prophet applies the titles of Jehovah, 'Wonderful-Counsellor,' and 'Mighty-God.' He is to be born of 'the maiden,' who is described by a term which does not necessarily denote virginity, but which at least the Jews of Alexandria did certainly interpret as implying virginity. It was only when the prophecies were appealed to by the Christians in proof of the Messiahship of the Virgin-born Jesus that the Jewish interpreters refused to admit that the word could be translated 'virgin,' and denied that the prophet was foretelling the birth of the Messiah. The Christians saw a portrait of Jesus in Isaiah's description of the Messiah, who, though of supernatural endowments and supernatural birth, nevertheless passes through a childhood of privation. In the same way they immediately applied to Jesus the pathetic prophecy concerning the Man of Sorrows.

Of this prophecy even Renan remarked that 'its colours might be said to have been taken from Jesus.'[1] And there was for a long time a conviction among the better Jewish commentators that a character whose perfections appealed so strongly to their hearts, must be the Messiah Himself. Whether any of the Jews of our Lord's time expected a suffering Messiah, is a question which has perhaps not been definitely settled. But the Talmud certainly speaks frequently of the Messiah as suffering, and Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* represents a liberal-minded Jew of the second century readily admitting the Messianic interpretation of *Isaiah* liii. 7. That Justin is not misrepresenting the opinions of the Jews of the period is proved by a similar statement on the part of his contemporary, Rabbi Joses the

[1] *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, vol. iii. p. 484.

Galilean. This interpretation long survived. It was retained by the great Jewish medieval scholar Maimonides, and faith in the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah survived among the Jews as late as the sixteenth century. It has even left clear traces in the prayers still used by the German Jews on the day of Atonement.

But the Jewish commentators were so conscious that *Isaiah* liii. was one of the most powerful weapons in the whole Christian armoury, that they invented one interpretation after another in the efforts to break its force. In the third century we find among the Jews the idea that there would be two Messiahs: the Messiah ben Joseph, who would fall fighting before the gates of Jerusalem against the heathen world-power; and the Messiah ben David, who would vanquish the world-power and raise the other Messiah from the dead. The passage was said by others to refer to Jeremiah, Isaiah, Hezekiah, or Job. But the generally accepted interpretation was that the suffering Servant meant only the nation of Israel in exile, an interpretation which has been widely accepted by a school of modern critics. But to suppose that the Servant of the Lord in this passage is not a Person of the race of Israel, but only a personification of the race, as 'Britannia' is a personification of the British people, leads us into a labyrinth of difficulties. It forces us to believe that the prophet puts the whole passage into the mouths of heathen speakers; it represents the people of Israel as ideally humble and innocent, whereas they had deeply sinned; it presupposes that the race was exterminated during the exile; and by making Israel a satisfaction or guilt-offering for the nations, it represents the prophet as contradicting his own doctrine that Jehovah has given other peoples as a ransom for the life of Israel (xliii. 3, 4). If the Servant in this passage be a Person representing all that is best in Israel, it is intelligible

throughout, but if the prophet is only speaking of the people of Israel, he left behind him a problem which cannot be solved. The Christian who reads the tortuous explanations of Abarbanel and his modern sceptical followers will probably echo the acute remark of Rabbi Mosheh Kohen Ibn Crispin, that the doors of the interpretation have been shut in their face, and they have wearied themselves to find the entrance.[1]

The great difficulty of the Jews has been to reconcile the idea of a Messiah who shall be invested with divine authority with the idea of a Messiah who shall suffer an ignominious death. But the early Christians with the greatest confidence attached their preaching of the dying and risen Jesus to this great chapter. They read it in the light of two facts—the fact that Jesus had taught them that He was the Messiah, and the fact that He had also taught them that His death would be for the remission of sins and that He would be 'numbered among the transgressors.' It is not difficult for us to imagine what an advantage the Christian missionary possessed over the Jewish missionary when he could point the Gentile inquirer to the Cross of Jesus as the fulfilment of the prophet's hope. But the Christians could not have dared to speak of the Cross in this connexion unless they had also been able to point to the empty grave and assert that the Servant rose again to 'prolong His days.' It is not enough to consider the way in which the first Christians realised the identity of the Messiah and that Servant of the Lord who 'was wounded for our transgressions.' We must also notice how they taught that a relation could be established between the martyred Messiah and the transgressing and rebellious members of His people.

[1] *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters*, S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer, vol. ii. p. 99 (James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1877). The value of this collection of ancient Jewish interpretations cannot be exaggerated.

The early chapters of *Acts* are peculiarly interesting when we study them with a view to gaining light upon this question. And nothing will do more than this study to confirm our conviction that their teaching is really primitive. Some of the great truths of the Atonement are only there in germ. But the central truth is there—the sinner gains forgiveness through identifying himself with Jesus. For this identification repentance, faith, and baptism are required. And the first thing which S. Peter tries to do is to deepen a sense of sin in his hearers. Only seven weeks before his first preaching the Jews had crucified Jesus as an impostor. It would therefore have been of little use to teach them any full doctrine about our Lord being the propitiation for our sins, or to tell them that the death of Jesus was the greatest possible proof of the love of God. S. Peter is wiser than this. Without using any language calculated to irritate and inflame, he lays stress upon their personal guilt in crucifying Jesus. He speaks of the crucifixion as a great crime, committed by 'lawless men' and 'wicked hands,' a crime which God showed to be indisputably a crime by the manner in which He had thwarted it (ii. 22 ff.; iii. 13 ff.). They had 'denied,' 'crucified,' 'hanged' One who was righteous. Shafts like these went home. The high priest himself said that the disciples intended 'to bring this man's blood upon us' (v. 28). They did so intend, but not in the manner which the high priest supposed.

In this attempt to deepen a sense of sin in his hearers S. Peter was pursuing the method employed by the Baptist and by our Lord Himself. Repentance was their first word. Men were to 'repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Without a serious change of mind, a repudiation of sin and the world's view of sin, no one could be taken into the kingdom of the Messiah. God the Father is the source of all

forgiveness, and He forgives like a human master or father moved with compassion. The Son also forgives (*S. Matthew* ix. 6), and He delegates this power to His disciples (*S. John* xx. 23). Repentance is what S. Peter and the other apostles desire to see manifested. Words expressing repentance occur several times, and the repentance is more than a deep regret. It is a repentance which is directed by faith or belief. Sometimes we only find a reference to 'them that believed' (iv. 32) and 'the believers' (v. 14), without a further definition; but it is evident that this belief was in something capable of definition, otherwise we could not read of people being 'obedient to the faith' (vi. 7). And we find Jesus mentioned as the Object of faith (iii. 16; x. 43); and together with faith in Jesus belief is required in 'good tidings concerning the kingdom of God' (viii. 12).

Repentance and faith were attested by Christian baptism. This was not a baptism on the same level as that administered by John. His was a 'baptism unto repentance,' as he himself explained it (*S. Matthew* iii. 11). It expressed the contrition of the person baptized. But Christian baptism expressed not only contrition, but also faith in Jesus. And to this baptism, and this only, are attached the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The different Greek words (εἰς and ἐν) employed to describe the relation of the believer to Christ in the act of being baptized mean the same thing.[1] The candidate for baptism made a confession of his belief in Jesus as his Lord, and he was baptized 'in' or 'with' the name of the Son pronounced over him with the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost. The remission of sins granted in this baptism, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, ordinarily granted by the laying-on of hands, are the distinctive blessings of the new dispensa-

[1] J. Armitage Robinson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1906.

tion, the privileges of the community of the Messiah. This can be shown to have been true from the very first. In *Acts* ii. 38 S. Peter says, 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Before any blessing is given, there must be repentance. It is necessary to 'turn again, that your sins may be blotted out' (iii. 19). Jesus has been exalted into heaven in order that this repentance and remission of sins may be possible (v. 31). And the witness of the ancient prophets points to the truth that 'through his name' remission can be gained (x. 43). All this, when combined with the description of Jesus as God's 'Holy Servant,' shows that a direct relation existed in the apostles' minds between the sufferings of the Messiah and the needs of the human soul. In fact, the sufferings of Christ are regarded as part of His appointed Messianic work (ii. 23; iii. 18). The apostles come to men offering them two priceless gifts—God's forgiveness and the power of a new spiritual life, the power of the same Spirit as has turned them from weak doubting men into intrepid champions of the truth. A method alike moral and sacramental exists for the appropriation of these gifts. And the gifts are only granted to those who surrender themselves to Jesus, who is both the divine Lord and the Servant of Jehovah who suffered vicariously.

The more we reflect upon the early chapters of this book the more we shall realise the value of this method of preaching the Gospel. The foundations of the Christian life are laid deep down. Not love only, but love that has experienced forgiveness, is the principle of Christian growth. Under all human love for God there must be repentance, conversion from sin, and a lasting sorrow for sin. Where these always exist, there will also exist that dependence upon Christ which alone enables us to live and to think as Chris-

tians. There is an extraordinarily close connexion between the shallow and semi-Christian theology now popular and a shallow estimate of sin and repentance; and it must be expected that if men are ignorant of their own characters and satisfied that they need no repentance, they will be content with a Christ of their own creation. Instinctively the Christian Church in preaching Him whose very name implied that He would save His people from their sins, felt from the first that in telling men to repent she was preparing them to know who Jesus is.

Again, this primitive Church in Jerusalem, intensely sacramental and therefore intensely social, earnestly—though sometimes mistakenly—trying to do what Christ would wish men to do, had grasped the principle of remission as well as the principle of repentance. In a certain sense, the remission or putting away of our sins must be gradual on God's part as on our own part. But, in another sense, it is not gradual. The moment that a repentant man has faith in Jesus Christ, has made in his own resolve the commands of Christ the end of his own spiritual endeavour, and submitted to God's way of granting what his soul requires, he is fit for forgiveness. God remits his sins, imputing to him what he means and intends. The very word 'remission' is so used in the New Testament as to imply that God forgives us freely, turning His eyes to our future and not to our past. The man who has really entered upon his truer life can say:

> 'The past is like a travell'd land now sunk
> Below the horizon—like a barren shore
> That grew salt weeds, but now all drown'd in love
> And glittering at full tide—the bounteous bays
> And havens filling with a blissful sea.'

But the tide of forgiveness cannot flow while the man prefers the harbour mud or the stretch of barren sand.

It is impossible that we should thoroughly discuss

the relation between this primitive doctrine of the Atonement and the fuller doctrine of S. Paul. Much that we find in S. Paul is absent. For instance, there is nothing of the mystical crucifixion and resurrection of the believer which is so prominent in S. Paul's doctrine of the identification of the Christian with Christ. But *Acts* strongly corroborates S. Paul's statement in 1 *Corinthians* xv. 3 that among the chief points of the tradition which he received was the fact 'that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.' And when he says that Jesus our Lord 'was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification' (*Romans* iv. 25), he is only stating the earliest Jewish Christian teaching in the simplest and most pointed form.

§ 2. *The First Epistle of S. Peter.*

From this short consideration of certain points in the teaching of *Acts* we can pass to the *First Epistle of S. Peter*. It is not written to explain Christian doctrine, but to teach Christian duty, and console men threatened with persecution. But in no part of the New Testament do we find the thought of the Atonement more constantly before us. The writer speaks of our Lord's blood, His death, and His sufferings, in eight passages. They show an advance on the theology of S. Peter's speeches in *Acts*, for there is a clearer expression of the redemptive character of Christ's death, and there is none of the indignation with which he once denounced the crime of the crucifixion. He now sees it *sub specie eternitatis* more clearly than he did at first. At the same time, the doctrine is less developed than that of S. Paul, though certainly not less prominent.

The relation of this Epistle to the theology of S. Paul is of grave importance when the question of its

genuineness is considered. But if the author has, as some maintain, made use of S. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans* and that to the Ephesians, the genuineness of the letter is not thereby excluded. Of course, it would be excluded if it could be shown that 1 *S. Peter* represented a conscious attempt to bridge over the difference between S. Paul's teaching and some form of doctrine that could be proved to have been professed by S. Peter in opposition to S. Paul. And its genuineness would probably be excluded if the use made of S. Paul's works in this Epistle were a mere plagiarism, or the insertion of Pauline patches on an alien material. None of these imaginable possibilities actually exist. It is not accurate even to describe the theology of this Epistle as a modified Paulinism, or a reflection of Paulinism. It contains, indeed, the same fundamental conceptions with regard to our Lord and His work as we find in S. Paul; and they are coloured by certain ideas which were not only common to these two apostles, but were probably current in the whole primitive Christian Church. Even the marked similarity in the quotations made from the Old Testament in *Romans* ix. 33 and 1 *S. Peter* ii. 6, 8, may be accounted for by the possible use of some collection of Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah. There is nothing improbable in the theory that S. Peter read S. Paul's principal Epistles; indeed, if they were both in Rome in the seventh decade of the first century, as tradition asserts, there are few things more likely to have happened. But we can never lose sight of the fact that S. Paul writes as a theologian and a mystic, while S. Peter writes as a pastor of the sheep and lambs of Christ. He is a man of different temperament as well as less intellectual ability. In spite of a fundamental agreement, there is a marked difference in their arguments. The antithesis between Grace and Works, Spirit and Letter, Law and Promise, Pre-

destination and Free Will, is absent in S. Peter. With him 'faith' is less mystical, and nearer in meaning to hope; he uses 'sin' and 'grace' in senses which vary slightly but perceptibly from the meaning of S. Paul. On the whole, this Epistle suggests a primitive simplicity of belief rather than a feeble comprehension of S. Paul on the part of a later imitator. And without dogmatically denying that the writer has been influenced by S. Paul, we are quite justified in holding that it represents a distinct type of Christian thought, closely akin to the Synoptists, and worthy of the first of the apostles. And if this is so, we can regard S. Peter's teaching on the Atonement as his own, and not as an attenuated version of another man's Gospel.

One important characteristic of this Epistle is its consistently Jewish tone. The writer is a Jew, who habitually thinks of the people of the Messiah as inheriting the promises made to the patriarchs. The Christians are 'strangers and pilgrims,' like the patriarchs; for them is reserved 'the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled,' of which the inheritance of Canaan was but a figure. They are 'an elect race,' the 'consecrated nation,' the 'people' whom God hath made His own. They are the very house of God (ii. 4); they are priests of a more august line than that of Aaron, for their priesthood is royal. This succession of the Christian people to all the glories of Israel is expressed with a new and deep significance in the statement that they are 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ' (i. 2). Here we find three elements in the making of a Christian in which the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are concerned. The cause is the Father's foreknowledge, the means is sanctification by the Holy Spirit in baptism (cf. iii. 21), and the end is, first, moral obedience, and, secondly, a share in the covenant which was

cemented by the shedding of Christ's blood. These three clauses are expanded in the remainder of the chapter (v. 3-25). The Epistle, therefore, has its basis in the fact of the Atonement, an Atonement which we appropriate by the aid of the Holy Spirit. As the Jewish race was received into a unique relationship with God at Mount Sinai by being sprinkled with sacrificial blood, so by the blood shed on Calvary a new elect race is separated from the rest of mankind and dedicated to God. S. Peter believes that it is the death of Christ which makes the life of a Christian possible, and that a man leads a Christian life when he avails himself of the efficacy of Christ's Passion.

What Christ actually did in His Passion is stated very plainly (ii. 24). 'His own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.' The context illustrates in a unique manner how completely S. Peter's thoughts were controlled by the Atonement. Writing at a period when the Neronian persecution had already begun, or was threatening to begin, he cherishes the hope that the good conduct of the Christians may put their adversaries to silence. And in this section he is making a special appeal to household servants to obey their masters. The imitation of Christ is the lesson which he desires to inculcate. Our Lord's patience is to be their pattern. It would have been enough for his purpose if he had spoken, as S. Paul speaks in his great appeal to the Philippians, of 'the mind that was in Christ Jesus,' who 'took the form of a bond-servant . . . becoming obedient even unto death' (*Philippians* ii. 7, 8). S. Paul, enthusiastically as he believed in the Atonement, could think of the death of Christ without mentioning its atoning character. But S. Peter seems to forsake and forget his immediate purpose; the moment that his thoughts reach the Cross, they sink into the central purpose of

the Heart of Jesus. And he sets before his readers no longer Christ as our Example, but Christ as our vicarious Sacrifice and the Giver of our new life. Christ is represented as both Priest and Victim. The word 'bear' has the double meaning of 'endure' and 'carry,' and it is the common word used in the Septuagint for bringing a sacrifice and laying it upon the altar. Jesus Christ both endured the consequences of our sins, and carried those sins as if they were His own to the altar of the Cross. The Victim was also the Priest. It was a voluntary act on his part, He carried His burden consciously and deliberately. And as a Victim He endured physically, no less than morally, the result of our sins. When Ezekiel, in chapter xviii. 20, says, 'The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son,' he declares that one shall not have to suffer for the evil action of the other, but 'the soul that sinneth, it shall die.' This and other passages of the Old Testament show us what S. Peter means. He has compressed two ideas into one pregnant verse; one idea is that our Lord suffered for the sins which He had not committed, the other that He suffered in order that we might be forgiven.

Very similar is the passage in the next chapter (iii. 13-18). Again the apostle wishes to prepare his readers for persecution. And he says, 'Who is he that will harm you, if ye be zealous of that which is good? But and if ye should suffer for righteousness' sake, blessed are ye.' He regards it as more or less unlikely that they will have to suffer, but if they have to suffer they are to reckon it a blessing, not fearing the threats of the heathen but 'sanctifying' Christ—that is, reverring Him, as the true Object of Christian fear. Then comes a remarkable antithesis which shows how thoroughly alien the apostle's thought was from the modern idea that Christ only suffered 'for righteous-

ness' sake.' If he had imagined that our Lord only suffered on account of His holy protest against a wicked world, he could most effectively have urged Christians to follow that great Example, who died because He was more righteous than His persecutors. But having said 'it is better that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing,' he adds, 'Because Christ also *suffered for sins once*, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God.' An important, and probably correct various reading is, *died for sins once*. Unquestionably S. Peter here assumes that it is good to follow that great Example. Not only so, but his argument seems to imply that his readers can co-operate in the atoning work of Christ, can bring others to God, by innocently suffering. Our sufferings may be made a means of bringing others to a free access to the Father, to that great privilege which elsewhere in the New Testament, as here, is regarded as the distinctive and peculiar prerogative of the Christian character. But all this can only rest on a fact which is past. It was the unique dying of Christ 'for sins,' that is, as a sin-offering offered for all men's sins, that opened the door to the presence of God. The suffering and dying took place once and once for all, and it is because Christ died that we are able to go to God and bring others to God. It was the death of 'the righteous for the unrighteous,' one Righteous Person died for all unrighteous people. If we read this verse in connexion with the verse which tells us that Christ 'bore our sins,' we see that S. Peter must mean more than that our Lord added a new element to human contrition for sin. He means that Christ felt some woe, took some responsibility upon Himself, which really belonged to the unrighteous, and that because He did this, man is set right with God. And He did it, not by dying precisely our death, for if our guilt had been literally transferred to Him He would not have been our sin-offering (see p. 77), but

by bearing our sins in sympathy, and by voluntarily giving to God that perfect offering which God had never before received from man and which we all owe to God. This may be fitly called a vicarious offering, and it involved vicarious suffering of the most acute kind. The suffering from which it delivers us is the suffering of separation from God. And we must observe that S. Peter does not imagine that the believer has to endure no pain and no discipline. The purifying power of suffering combined with well-doing is recognised to the full, it is regarded almost as a necessity. 'He that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin' (iv. 1). But it is because Christ died for us, and in so doing removed the obstacle of unforgiven sin between us and the Father, that we are able to suffer as we ought. He changes our 'manner of life.' To turn back to the earlier part of the Epistle, 'Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver and gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, *even the blood of Christ*' (i. 18, 19).

To sum up the teaching of this Epistle with regard to the death of Christ, we can say without hesitation that it teaches that (i) the access of men to God depends upon the death of Christ, (ii) salvation is a moral salvation from a sinful life, and gives us the power to do and suffer rightly. But to this we must add that (iii) the resurrection of Jesus Christ is as essential to the Christian as His death, because it is by virtue of the resurrection that baptism 'saves' us (iv. 21). Baptism has an inward power to cleanse the soul in response to the interrogation of a good conscience, because Christ rose again and is alive. Baptism means an identification with Christ by which the convert begins to avail himself of the Atonement. Here, as in the Gospels and in *Acts*, we reach an inseparable con-

nexion between the Atonement and the Sacraments which Christ is recorded to have instituted.

Of the brief *Epistle of S. Jude*, and of the *Second Epistle of S. Peter*, which is apparently based upon it, it is enough to say that they distinctly assume the simple current elements of apostolic teaching. S. Jude speaks strongly of the lordship of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit as the divine principle of the Christian life. The *Second Epistle of S. Peter*, though not concerned with the doctrine of the Atonement, distinctly alludes to the redemptive work of 'the Master' (ii. 1), and shows a special preference for the name 'Saviour' as a title of Christ. The former Epistle rebukes false teachers who are guilty of an immoral life, the latter false teachers who are also guilty of 'destructive heresies.' Both Epistles show the prevalence of a perversion of Christianity, which made the doctrine of grace an excuse for libertinism. The bearing of this error upon the true nature of apostolic Christianity will be shown in our next section.

§ 3. *The Epistle of S. James.*

The Epistle which Luther regarded with a lack of sympathy that became sheer contempt, is filled with a Christian spirit. It is marked by an austere beauty of thought, by a simple eloquence of style, by a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament, and a firm grasp upon the moral teaching of our Lord. That the authenticity of the Epistle should be frequently denied, is only what we might expect. If S. Paul's teaching about justification is misunderstood, it is almost inevitable that those who misunderstand it should deny that this Epistle was written by a contemporary of S. Paul.[1] Their denial has resulted in the fact that the most recent

[1] For recent Rationalistic views see A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (fifth edition, 1906).

hostile critics of this Epistle are divided into two parties. (i) On the one hand, there are those who maintain that the Epistle consists of a pre-Christian Jewish writing to which some additions have been made by a Christian admirer. (ii) And, on the other hand, there are those who declare that it shows the influence of S. Paul in such a way as to prove that it was written in the second century, when the strife about the necessity of Christians observing Jewish ceremonies was already over. The contradictory character of these two theories is sufficient evidence that the traditional authorship is difficult to disprove. With regard to the first theory, we can reply that if the Epistle shows the common moral ground on which the Jew who was a 'Jew inwardly' would naturally agree with the Christian, and shows no definite trace of S. Paul's influence, there can be no sufficient reason for doubting that it represents one of the earliest forms of Christian teaching. With regard to the second theory, we can reply that if the Epistle shows a clear trace of S. Paul's influence, its genuineness is not disproved unless it supports or attacks S. Paul's theology in a manner which befits a date later than S. Paul's own lifetime.

The hostile critics who assign the Epistle to a late date urge that an enthusiastic observer of the Jewish law like S. James could not have spoken of the worship of God as consisting in moral activity (i. 27), or spoken of 'the perfect law of liberty' (i. 25; ii. 12), or, above all, silently passed by the necessity of observing the Jewish ceremonial law. All this rests upon the hypothesis that a Jewish Christian saint must necessarily have regarded religious ceremonial as equally important with Christian morality, and never assimilated the spirit of our Lord's own teaching. If the Jewish Christians were as zealous for observing the law as we find them to have been both in the New Testament times and in the second century, it is hardly probable that

S. James, who treated S. Paul with entire friendliness, would have found it necessary to urge them to maintain the ceremonial law with redoubled zeal. Whereas nothing could be more natural than that he who observed the law himself without regarding it as universally necessary to salvation, should urge his readers to think of matters more important than ritual. Passages such as those quoted above might have been written by a devout Jewish Christian either before or after the controversy between S. Paul and the extreme Judaizers had begun. And the way in which the law is referred to in ii. 8-12 suggests that in this Epistle we are at the point of contact between the two religions, Judaism and Christianity. There is nothing here or in any part of the Epistle which is inconsistent with the figure of S. James as shown to us in the other historical sources such as the *Acts of the Apostles* and Hegesippus.

But, it is said, the discussion about the relation of faith to works must presuppose that S. Paul had already taught that justification by faith is essential to salvation. It misunderstands S. Paul, and in a manner which betrays an age later than that of the apostles. Let us examine this accusation. The famous text, *Genesis* xv. 6, 'Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness,' was a standing text for discussion in Jewish schools. It is quoted in 1 *Macc.* ii. 52; it is quoted and commented on frequently by Philo, and discussed in the Talmudic treatise *Mechilta*, where it is said that 'Abraham our father inherited this world and the world to come solely by faith.' The very place which Abraham held in Judaism made a discussion about his faith and works inevitable, and the first generation of Jewish Christians would hear such discussions and take part in them, independently of the questions raised by the conversion of the Gentiles. Nor is it at all unlikely that men who had meditated upon the teaching of our Lord, and

especially such sayings as 'thy faith hath saved thee,' should consider the relation of faith to works and the possible antithesis between them, before any discussion of the acute problems settled by the first Council of Jerusalem in A.D. 48.

If the author's teaching about the relation of faith and works is in substantial union with that of S. Paul, while differing from it in expression, there can be no good reason for denying the apostolic authorship of the letter. Verbal contradiction as to the essence of Christianity could hardly be more complete, and nevertheless practical agreement could hardly be more close. The thesis of S. Paul is 'We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law' (*Romans* iii. 28), and the thesis of S. James is 'Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith' (ii. 24). To understand these maxims we must set them in their proper context, and then the following points grow clear and evident. By '*being justified*' S. James means pardoned and received into God's favour. Abraham, formerly a pagan, was thus received and forgiven on account of his works (ii. 21-25), and Rahab the harlot, in spite of her sinful life, was also 'justified by works' (ii. 25). S. James is using the word in the very sense in which he had heard it on the lips of our Lord, who had spoken of the publican going home 'justified' rather than the Pharisee (*S. Luke* xviii. 14). By *works* S. James means works of self-sacrifice, submission to God's will, such as Abraham's willingness to offer up Isaac; or devotion to God's people, such as was shown by Rahab; or sincere love of the poor and the suffering, shown in social kindness or gifts of food and clothing. By *faith* S. James means what we call a monotheistic belief. His own words make this perfectly plain. It is the belief that 'God is one,' the belief which distinguishes Jews and Christians from pagans and

idolaters. The devils, he tells us, have this belief in one God (ii. 19). Such a belief may be, and often is, 'barren' and 'dead.' And it needs works to give it life and value. In the case of Abraham himself, faith required works to make it perfect, *i.e.* an accomplished fact, and faith wrought with his works (ii. 22). It is most important to observe that S. James does not teach that a man is justified only by works; it would be totally contradictory to his teaching to say that generosity in almsgiving would secure justification if the heart was not right in God's eyes. He says 'not *only* by faith.' It must be a faith co-operating with works, as in the case of Abraham.

A faith or belief so co-operating with good works is the faith that we call *trust*. It is confidence in God, and as such S. James speaks of it as necessary for prayer (i. 6), and furthermore he speaks of the 'rich in faith' as 'heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him' (ii. 5). The same idea is expressed in other verses such as 'Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you' (iv. 8). Such is religious faith, and nothing that we receive is merited, either by faith or works, apart from divine grace. On the contrary, all that we have and are is from God, and depends on 'his own will' (i. 18). The consequence of this faith is a good life, conformed to the moral law, which S. James calls the 'law of liberty,' and S. Paul calls 'the law of Christ,' giving liberty to us in Christ (*Galatians* ii. 4; vi. 2).

Not only do the two writers agree as to the nature of the Christian's life, but they so far agree in their doctrine that there is nothing in the teaching of S. James which contradicts S. Paul. It is quite true that S. Paul develops a rich theology in connexion with the word 'justified'; but with him as with S. James the root-meaning of the word is 'acquitted as righteous,' and so 'received into God's favour.'

S. Paul again finds a wealth of meaning in the word 'faith,' considered as 'confidence,' but, like S. James, he recognises that a barren faith is conceivable when he says 'if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not charity, I am nothing' (1 *Corinthians* xiii. 2). And what is perhaps more important is that 'the works of the law,' which he reckons as useless to the Christian, are not what he calls 'good works' (2 *Corinthians* ix. 8; *Colossians* i. 10; 2 *Timothy* ii. 21), but the observance of the rules of the Mosaic law. Man is not pardoned by God either because of his observance of ceremonial rules, or even by a union of such observance with good external moral rules without a heartfelt inward submission to God. But the faith required by God, because it is a complete, unconditional submission, necessarily implies good works; and at the last day we shall be judged according to our works (*Romans* ii. 5, 6).

It is high time that men should universally recognise that there was an element in Luther's teaching about justification by faith which was in a notable degree mischievous, and that a large amount of modern theology has not recovered from its deplorable influence. There is an antinomian and immoral element in that teaching which is the very contradiction of S. Paul's teaching about justification, and which, because it is antinomian, cannot be reconciled with the teaching of S. James. It was not F. C. Baur, but Luther, who was responsible for the notion that primitive Christianity consisted of two Christianities. And the notion is false to history. With equal logic and equal consistency, S. Paul in preaching 'faith' preached 'good works,' and S. James in preaching 'works' taught that the Kingdom of God belongs to the 'rich in faith.'

It may be asked 'What connexion has this discussion with the doctrine of the Atonement?' The con-

nexion is really very close. If the *Epistle of S. James* is really a forgery, or in the more euphemistic modern style, 'a specimen of pseudonymous epistolography,' written in the second century by an orthodox Christian, no one will deny that it takes the doctrine of the Atonement for granted. The critics who assign it to this late date do not imagine that it was written by either an Ebionite or a Gnostic, and do not suggest that the author repudiated the Catholic doctrines concerning the Person and the work of our Lord.

If, on the other hand, it was written by S. James, either before or after his acquaintance with S. Paul, it also presupposes the doctrine of the Atonement. The author is contending against a certain error—the error of maintaining that, so long as faith is correct, conduct does not matter. Such an error could only have arisen where it was believed that faith receives great gifts from God before the believer has done any outward action to deserve those gifts. Just as the bad Jew had believed, and still believed, that the divine promise given to Abraham antecedently to obedience exempted the Jew from the necessity of personal righteousness so long as he believed intellectually in God, so it was with the bad Christian. He thought that the free gifts conferred by God on all who believed in Christ were his, and his for ever, so long as he assented intellectually to God's revelation of Himself in Christ. He thought that he would remain in a state of justification if he once accepted salvation through Christ. Such a heresy could not have existed unless the Church commonly assumed and taught that salvation came through Christ alone.[1] And the manner in which S. James deals with the heresy shows that he believed this himself. His argument would have taken a totally

[1] A good account of the teaching about our Lord in this Epistle can be found in G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 287 ff.

different form if he had believed that Jesus Christ only came into the world to tell us to be good, and to be our example. He could have demolished the error which he abhorred by saying that the Gospel taught by 'the Lord of glory' consisted solely in promises attached to the practice of certain virtues. He could have said that the purpose of Christ's coming was not of such a nature as to make faith in His Person necessary, but only obedience to His moral teaching. That would have been a very effective criticism of the Antinomians. But the author does not say anything of the kind. He uses no such argument. And when we have the positive assertion of S. Paul in his *Epistle to the Galatians*, that S. James, like S. Peter and S. John, gave him 'the right hand of fellowship' when he went up to Jerusalem in A.D. 48, and did this after learning what Gospel it was that S. Paul preached, we have a very good reason for the absence of such an argument. Either S. James believed with S. Paul that 'Christ died for our sins,' or we must take refuge in the theory that the *Epistle to the Galatians* and the *Acts of the Apostles* are both travesties of the truth—a theory which is as unwelcome to the ordinary sceptic as to the ordinary Christian.[1]

In fact, the primitive Gospel did not primarily consist in the message that Christ had done what every man ought to do, but that He had done what no one else could ever do.

[1] This theory is advocated by the most extreme Dutch and German Rationalists, but is maintained by no scholar of repute.

CHAPTER VII

THE ATONEMENT AS TAUGHT BY S. PAUL

S. Paul died the death of a martyr outside the city walls of Rome, during Nero's persecution, in or very near A.D. 65. He had been a Christian for scarcely thirty years, and it is not probable that he had won more converts than some of the great missionaries of the last four centuries. But just as history gives us no parallel to S. Paul's Master, so history gives us no parallel to this great disciple. When he died, the Christian Church was already in essence a world-wide Church. He had been reduced to poverty, if he had not always been poor; his health was bad; his appearance insignificant; his speech was not persuasively eloquent; he was a member of an exclusive and unpopular race. But he had erected 'the pillar and ground of the truth' in one centre after another within the vast Roman Empire. The Catholic Church depicted in his *Epistle to the Ephesians* was actually built and thronged with enthusiastic, though often imperfect worshippers. We instinctively think of him as a writer of 'weighty' letters. But he was first and foremost a man of action, inspired by that charity whose form he has set before us carved in the most delicate and deeply incised language. His affection for his race is expressed in words that almost touch the fringe of blasphemy; his devotion to men who were not of his own race made him a wanderer and a beggar. He

succeeded for the simple reason that 'charity never faileth.' And his triumph is just this, that he established a kinship between the most opposing minds by convincing them of a truth which they were equally disinclined to believe. That truth was the fact of the Atonement; his preaching was, as he calls it, 'the word of the Cross.' If he had gone to the Gentile world omitting from his Gospel the elements which the Gentiles called 'foolishness,' and tried to make the Gentiles believe in Jesus in spite of His death, he would not have effected any permanent result. But his writings still retain a perennial power, because he boldly told men that they would only attain righteousness by means of the death of Jesus. In the Epistles which he dictated, we find thought succeeding thought, argument following argument, like the waves of a stormy sea, and very seldom possessing the clearness and the calm of the sayings of our Lord. But there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that his 'word of the Cross' is ever the creation of the moment, or that it contains any real inconsistency. It is the fruit of prolonged thought, and such fruit as can only be produced after the most real experiences, both moral and religious.

In the teaching of S. Paul as in that of our Lord, the moral and the religious elements are absolutely inseparable. The very starting-point of his theology is the assumption that man must attain righteousness. He never gives a definition of righteousness, because he knows that his readers are in some degree familiar with the idea. Broadly speaking, righteousness is a combination of self-assertion with self-sacrifice in perfect proportion, and therefore it covers the whole range of good actions. Such a harmony between self-assertion and self-sacrifice finds a sanction in the psychological constitution of moral human nature. The fact that man is capable of goodness is an obligation to good-

ness. Now the Jew was correct in his conviction that this psychological sanction is bound to a religious sanction. A knowledge of the will of God, such as is contained in the writings of the great teachers of Israel, stimulated and strengthened the desire for righteousness. But the Jew, while priding himself upon his knowledge of the will of God, and sincerely striving after righteousness, had gone far astray. It would be unfair to suppose that the pious Jew cared only for an external correctness in conduct and in ceremonial, or that he always cared more anxiously for what a man did than for the spirit in which he did it. No Jew who loved his Psalter could have entertained so mean a view of righteousness. But nevertheless the tendency of the Judaism with which S. Paul was familiar, the hard official piety of the Scribes and Pharisees, was to forget the spirit of the prophets, and to lay such stress upon the smaller details of the Law and rabbinical additions to the Law, that the greater matters which ought to attract and subdue the heart were neglected. Life was too short and the human mind too small to find room for a close attention to everything that God commanded as well as everything that the rabbis exacted. And apart from the Pharisaic additions, the Mosaic Law itself was venerated almost as if it were a person by the side of God, or between the human soul and God. The result was the inevitable result which always happens when laws are looked upon as an end and not as a means. The Law was sometimes interpreted with too much laxity, sometimes applied with unmerciful hardness, and the worth of human motives was lowered in comparison with the worth of human achievements. The stream of true religion was ice-bound, and nothing less than the Sun of righteousness could make its waters flow.

S. Paul when converted saw this. When Christ was

'all in all' to him, his personal religion and personal morality were reconciled with one another. Religion implied a moral transformation, a personal proving of 'the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.' And at the same time morality needed the aid of religion, a frank recognition that the weakness of our nature and our opposition to a known ideal are only remedied by the free goodness of God. S. Paul's arguments may sometimes seem too closely twisted to be easily unravelled by a modern Gentile reader. But in the midst of them all he writes sentences of that extreme simplicity which men use when they try to express their deepest thoughts. Does a man wish to do his duty towards his fellow men? Then S. Paul tells him that 'love is the fulfilment of the law.' Does he wish to know how to live in peace with God? Then S. Paul tells him that the method is 'faith working through love.' And the object of faith is the 'Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me.' The sight of God revealed in Christ, made him resolve to know nothing but 'Jesus Christ, and him crucified.' He soon ousted the Law from the throne which it had occupied. It had been the soul of morality; henceforth morality was to be the outward body and expression, not of the Law, but of that faith which the saints of the Old Testament had seen to be the true disposition of man towards His Maker. Only very ignorant or very prejudiced readers can suppose that S. Paul was an Antinomian, and that his teaching tolerates any moral licence. He takes the greatest pains to show, and he shows conclusively, that liberty is not licence. And to accuse S. Paul of Antinomianism is as unreasonable as to declare that a civilised country becomes Antinomian when it becomes autonomous. But that faith does mean freedom he teaches beyond question. And at any period when there is a tendency to reject Christianity as being a

form of intellectual or moral bondage, it is well to see how S. Paul was filled with the certainty that Christ makes men free. Sin and error, injustice and inward discord, vanish under His liberating hand; and if our freedom is ever cramped, it is because we serve Christ too little and not because we serve Him too much.

§ 1. *Man's Sin and God's Wrath.*

Before considering S. Paul's doctrine of the Atonement, it is necessary to say something about his doctrine of Sin, although the limits of this book make any full account of it quite impossible. S. Paul quite definitely states that sin is universal; it is a misuse of man's power of choice; and all men have sufficient knowledge to make their sinful actions inexcusable. He also frequently personifies sin, speaking of it as coming into the world and ruling mankind, and this personification of sin must be studied in relation to his clear certainty that there is a personal Satan. But sin is also the outcome of a tendency, a sinful bias, which men inherit.[1]

It is in connexion with the idea of a sinful bias that he draws a well-known but puzzling parallel between Adam and Christ in *Romans* v. 12-21 (cf. 1 *Corinthians* xv. 44 ff.). The aim of the passage is to show that God's mercy manifested in Christ more than outweighs the mighty power of sin. To the universal power of sin S. Paul opposes the universally offered gift of grace; and he traces these two universal streams to their respective sources, Adam and Christ. He assumes that Adam was the natural head of the race as Christ is the spiritual head. Sin began with Adam's transgression,

[1] An admirable account of S. Paul's doctrine of Sin can be found in the Commentary on *Romans*, by Sanday and Headlam.

and with sin came death. What kind of death? Not merely physical death, which S. Paul conceives may be a gain, and not a loss (*Philippians* i. 21); nor merely spiritual death, which is moral alienation from God (*Ephesians* ii. 1). Like most Jews, but perhaps more than any Jew, S. Paul regards this death as a physiological phenomenon, but also as something far more. For it came to express God's judgment upon sin, and the sting in it is sin. It would be misleading to say without further explanation that S. Paul teaches that death would not have existed in the world if there had been no sin, just as it would be misleading to quote his words that Christ has 'abolished death,' as though they meant that no Christian can physically die. This can be shown from the words which he applies to Adam, words which are in striking contrast to many later and less moderate statements. Putting aside all later theological and scientific questions, we can briefly say as follows: Adam is regarded by S. Paul as undeveloped, innocent, weak, capable of moral choice. It is not at all clear that he is regarded as having been endowed with a nature strictly immortal, for he was 'earthy,' and it is plainly implied that he was not dominated by the 'spiritual' faculty (1 *Corinthians* xv. 47). But it seems to be implied that he might have developed this faculty and did not so; and that if he had not sinned, he would in some way have attained to immortality through a cessation of earthly life different from death as we now know it. But S. Paul is not so much preoccupied with these questions as to discuss them elaborately anywhere. In *Romans* he wishes to emphasise the surpassing grace of God; and incidentally he teaches that as the moral death to sin in the whole Christian race and their life here and hereafter have a cause and explanation in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, so there is a corresponding unity and solidarity in the natural world. The sins of the

natural world, and death in the form that we see, have a cause and explanation in the first sin of man, which has affected the whole race by heredity. When we sin, there is no fatal necessity laid upon us; but there is an existing tendency to which we may yield, and there is a remedy of which we may avail ourselves. And the apostle thanks God that the sin which 'reigned in death' is less potent than the grace which 'reigns unto eternal life' (*Romans* v. 21).

With the existence of sin we must connect the existence of God's wrath (*Romans* v. 9). The doctrine of the Atonement is sometimes said to be inconsistent with the love of God, because it implies the removal of God's wrath, and it is said that if we attribute wrath to God, we make Him guilty of like passions with ourselves. In answer to this objection we cannot deny that in the New Testament the wrath of God is frequently mentioned or implied. And S. John even uses the sublime paradox of speaking about 'the wrath of the Lamb.' The question of course really is, What is meant by 'wrath'? Is it conceivable that the apostles and evangelists should have sunk so far below the spiritual conceptions of the greater Hebrew prophets as to attribute to God thoughts and feelings which are no higher than our own? Is it possible that they thought that God, if we may dare to say it, is capable of losing His temper? It is not possible. A false anthropomorphism is to be laid to the charge not of those who maintain that there is, in the Biblical sense of the word, such a thing as the wrath of God. It is rather to be laid to the charge of those who encourage the idea that God is like an easy, good-natured, benevolent man. We do no dishonour to God when we believe that God may be represented under conceptions formed by our own best experience. 'There is no pride in thinking that our highest acts

and thoughts are types of the divine. There is no reason and no true humility in assuming this relation to be incredible."[1]

There is such a thing as righteous human indignation, a godly wrath. Broadly speaking, we all know that there are sins of meanness, cruelty, and foulness, towards which every good man must feel a necessary hostility. The person who is weakly indulgent towards sins of ingratitude or impurity, which make men lower than the beasts, has himself sunk to a level which is not truly natural or human. Is this indignation compatible with love, can it exist side by side with the self-sacrificing desire to promote the good of the sinner? It can. Doubtless in our fragmentary characters indignation and love do not often exist side by side. But such a coincidence is not at all unknown to us. Every parent knows the pain and anger with which he views an unnecessary fault, a gratuitous and more or less deliberate sin, in his child. So far from such anger being the contradiction of love it is a manifestation of it. Of course it is not a manifestation of love when the parent is vindictive and spiteful, and when he provokes his child to anger. But anger may be loving, and it need not necessarily be harsh or selfish. There is a third aspect of godly wrath which deserves consideration. It is anger with ourselves. It is possible to feel mere remorse for having done wrong, the blind, gnawing pain which is utter disgust with self. It is possible to be angry with oneself with a feeling which is less than remorse, a feeling of wounded pride and touchiness, a feeling caused by the knowledge that we are not so estimable as we thought ourselves. This is sinful anger. But there is also a form of anger which we can feel against our lower self, an anger which is humble but hopeful; the anger which is prepared to frame a wholesome

[1] Duke of Argyll, *Philosophy of Belief*, p. 250.

discipline and to enforce it, an anger which places us on the side of God.

If we then can be righteously angry both with ourselves and with others, why should not we believe that God can be righteously angry with His own creation, with His children? S. Paul on the one hand attributes to God 'love' and 'grace' (that is undeserved kindness), and on the other hand he attributes to Him 'righteousness' and 'wrath.' Sinners are exposed to the wrath of God, and this wrath is 'revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men' (*Romans* i. 18). Sinners are not only God's active enemies; they are even described as the objects of His hostility (*Romans* v. 10; xi. 28). But behind this hostility there is the whole character of God, who is a God of mercy, and wills the salvation of all men. If the wrath of God could be isolated, if it acted by itself, then we could say that the Christian God is a savage God, and that we must say farewell either to this God or to the Christian doctrine of the Atonement. But this wrath does not exist by itself. God is 'rich in mercy' (*Ephesians* ii. 4); the heart of His plan for the world is 'that he might have mercy upon all' (*Romans* xi. 32), and that we might be 'saved from the wrath of God' (*Romans* v. 9). Our reconciliation with God is God's own work. He saves us not by acting in accordance with one special attribute of His character, but by the action of His whole nature. It is therefore a treachery both to our own ideas of right and wrong and to the theology of the New Testament to suppose that the wrath of God excludes the love of God. God is good, immutably good. He desires not the death of the sinner, but the death of sin.

And the death of sin is the result of the Atonement.

§ 2. *Outline of S. Paul's Doctrine of the Atonement.*

(*a*) God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself (2 *Corinthians* v. 19); while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son (*Romans* v. 10); and the Colossians are told that 'being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled you in the body of his flesh through death' (*Colossians* i. 21, 22). The meaning of these passages is clear. It is that there is a work of Christ now finished, a work done for Hebrews such as S. Paul himself is, and Gentiles such as the Colossians are. It was done by Christ living on earth and by Christ dying on earth. It was not done by Him as by a person intervening between God and mankind, but as by One in whom God was made manifest. The action of Christ is God's action: in one Epistle God the Father is said to have effected the reconciliation, in another the Son is said to have effected it. If the action of Christ is thus inseparable from the action of the Father, the mind of the Father towards mankind is inseparable from the mind of the Son; and S. Paul shows this plainly. In the first passage quoted above, God's work of reconciliation is described under the term 'not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were intreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.' A virtual reconciliation of all mankind was made when Jesus had lived and died, for He perfectly realised the divine life under human conditions; but the actual reconciliation of the individual man only takes place when he consents to return to God. The Father wishes to reconcile every

man to Himself, and all that Christ did and suffered, especially on the Cross, calls men back to God. They are encouraged to come, because God welcomes them when He might condemn. In view of the extraordinary perversion of S. Paul's teaching about 'imputation,' which took place in Reformation and Post-Reformation theology, it is necessary to say that the words translated 'reckon' or 'impute' are a perfectly natural metaphor taken from making an entry in a ledger. S. Paul means that God in Christ did not judge us by reckoning up our sins and reproaching us with them. And when he argues that circumcision was received by Abraham after 'his faith was reckoned for righteousness,' he means that God gave Abraham credit for the right will implied in it, intending also that all to whom He might thereafter credit the same right will should be the recipients of the same favours as any circumcised child of the chosen race. S. Paul, unlike Luther and the authors of the Presbyterian Westminster Confession, never speaks of God imputing or reckoning the righteousness or the obedience of Christ to believers. He does speak of God not imputing our own trespasses to us. God, then, reconciles man to Himself by showing us Himself as He really is. We must soon consider other aspects of the Atonement taught by S. Paul, but at present we can dwell upon the truth that the life and the death of Jesus Christ were not the cause, but the outcome of the love of God for mankind. 'God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us' (*Romans* v. 8). God means us to know that it is His nature to love, to bear, and to forgive. And we shall know it if in the Crucified Form upon the Cross we see with S. Paul the human embodiment of the divine nature, the revelation of the infinite in finite terms, the Mediator of eternal pity in a life of human love. Christ is more than even S. Paul

could know, but He is not less. He is both God and Man. And therefore He is the One in whom man is reconciled to God.

(*b*) Christ is an oblation and sacrifice. S. Paul says, 'Walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell' (*Ephesians* v. 2). It is remarkable that S. Paul should not have spoken more frequently of Christ as a sacrifice. This verse stands alone, and yet it is made quite intelligible by other passages in which the apostle speaks of Christians offering their bodies as a sacrifice to God (*Romans* xii. 1), and their oblations for his own support as 'a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God' (*Philippians* iv. 18). In the first of these two passages the apostle's words imply that the relation between the Christian's sacrifice of himself and the Jewish sacrifice of animals is partly one of distinction and partly one of identity. The Jewish sacrifice implied slaughter, while the Christian's sacrifice of himself implies a new and continued life through union with the risen Christ. But both the Jew and the Christian are considered as under the rigid obligation to offer to God a body which is pure and without blemish. So the offering which Christ made to the Father was the offering of a spotless human nature. The spirit in which He offered Himself was analogous to the spirit and meaning which the Jews connected with the burnt-offering, the spirit of complete surrender and whole-hearted devotion to God. 'A sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell' was offered by the Son to the Father. Having taken human nature upon Him, He offered it wholly to the glory of God, though this devotion involved 'the death of the Cross.'

S. Paul therefore conceives of the atoning work of Christ as a revelation of God reconciling man to God; and also as a sacrifice in which man was represented

to God, and which satisfied God's fatherly love by the completeness of the devotion which it involved.

(*c*) The dying Christ is not only a sacrifice, but 'a means of propitiation.' In a passage in the *Epistle to the Romans* (iii. 23 ff) containing a brief but very pregnant statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, S. Paul says, 'All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation (or means of propitiation), through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.' The meaning is that before the Incarnation God had been so forbearing with sin that men were apt to think lightly of it and continue sinning; and to check sin God indicated His righteousness by a method which both showed God's true character and enabled Him to justify all men who have faith in Jesus. God 'justifies,' that is, accepts as righteous, acquits as righteous, those who accept Christ as their Lord by a deliberate moral choice. He accepts them because when they believe in Jesus, sin becomes to them what it is to Jesus, a selfish, hateful rebellion against the divine Father. And by the same method of pardon God shows His own true character: He does justice to Himself, revealing His own will and His own being, in fact, His righteousness or justice. There is no need to narrow the meaning of this righteousness into a mere severity or the readiness to inflict a deserved punishment. S. Paul has spoken of God as providing a redemption freely by His grace or undeserved loving-kindness, and this was one aspect of His righteousness. But the passage does evidently imply that the death of Christ did something to

counterbalance God's forbearance of sin, and therefore the passage must denote that God in the death of Christ showed His condemnation of sin. The righteousness of God shown in the dying Christ is therefore judicial righteousness; it demanded and secured a 'propitiation.' And God secured it by giving it. He exhibited His judicial righteousness, His reaction against sin, and condemnation of sin, by showing that sin must no longer go unpunished unless removed by the propitiation which He Himself furnished. All this is usually granted by Christian commentators. But they sometimes think that S. Paul means that God was under a moral obligation not to forgive sin until He had *punished* it, and that He punished sin in punishing Christ. On the contrary, S. Paul's teaching is that God could not forgive sin until He had *condemned* it (*Romans* viii. 3). And He condemned it at the tremendous cost of sending His own Son to be a means of propitiation by His blood.

We have previously seen what the teaching of the Old Testament with regard to propitiation and blood really is. The Levitical sacrifices do not imply that the sinner's guilt is transferred to the sacrificed animal. Sacrificial propitiation was regarded as a vindication of the holiness of God, which purified or neutralised sin by means of sacrificed blood, *i.e.* by the symbol of a communion of life between God and His people. Sacrificial propitiation is primarily this cancelling of sin and simultaneous cleansing of the sinner. And S. Paul keeps strictly to the doctrine which the Levitical sacrifices taught by symbols. He assumes that the death of Jesus Christ was a ransom for sin, an offering of loving and reasonable devotion of infinite value in the eyes of God, a sacrifice which, like the sin- and guilt-offerings of the Old Testament, was acceptable because 'very holy,' and not because guilt had been transferred to the victim. And this sacrifice of Christ becomes

propitiatory or expiatory for the individual sinner 'through faith.' When he morally and deliberately desires to avail himself of what Christ has done, the expiatory power and effect of Christ's death will infallibly cleanse his soul and neutralise his sin. The view of God's character seen in Christ, and especially in the death of Christ, will call forth real penitence and faith. They will perform all the discipline which the most severe punishment could ever perform, and much more. There is therefore the closest possible connexion between the past work of Christ and the present inner life of the Christian. And we can say without hesitation that when S. Paul says that through Christ 'we have now received the reconciliation,' he means that Christ did what no one else could do for him. He both revealed God and represented mankind as no one else could ever do, and He died on our behalf. This death involved something which we can imperfectly describe as vicarious punishment, just as we may speak of a mother suffering an undeserved vicarious punishment in the moral pain which she endures on behalf of her children. But if we do use the word punishment of Christ's sufferings, we must divest ourselves completely of some of the ideas which we are apt to associate with punishment. They were not sufferings by which God secured vengeance, as though He demanded 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' They were part of a voluntary sacrifice which was a substitute for punishment. It was a propitiation. In other words it is a moral force which cleanses us from sin, and in so doing necessarily arrests punishment. And though it exercises this moral and subjective influence upon man, the death of our Lord affects God as well as man, for it was both a perfect filial offering to the Father and the Father's own appointed method for condemning all human sin.

(*d*) Lastly, the death of Christ would not have been

a 'means of propitiation' if it had not been followed by the Resurrection. Apart from the Resurrection, the Crucifixion would have been in the eyes of S. Paul exactly what it was in the eyes of a Jew, namely, the punishment of a sinner. But the Resurrection was as real as the Crucifixion. It was also, like the death of Christ, representative and symbolical. When the sinner sees the Cross, he realises how Christ in the intensity of His love identified Himself with sinners. If he does so realise it, he will identify himself with Christ by faith. He devotes himself to Christ, he makes the mind of Christ his own mind, and thereby chooses Christ as representing what he ought to be and desires to be. We cannot say to a man, 'Go your way, you have nothing to do, it was only a great transaction between God and His Son in which you have only to believe.' The Atonement is not near completion so far as we are personally concerned until we can say with S. Paul, 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me' (*Galatians* ii. 20).

We must here return for a moment to what has been said above (p. 193) about the relation of Christ to Adam. Through one man sin entered into the world, and in Adam all die (1 *Corinthians* xv. 21, 22). Adam's act was a racial act, for in his act of sinning there came to expression and to the divine judgment tendencies which are universal in the human race. A divine command came to him and he rebelled. S. Paul regards the whole human race as on its trial in Adam. The race failed to stand the test, and as sinning passed under condemnation. 'As through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life' (*Romans* v. 18). The act of the second Adam cancels the act of the first Adam. S. Paul does not ignore the freedom of our

moral choice. He speaks of it elsewhere. Here he is dealing with another aspect of the problem. And he assumes that Christ, as the Son of God, is not one human individual, but the representative of all humanity. His 'act of righteousness' in accepting death was the act of humanity, and His triumph is the triumph of humanity. So far as physical death followed Adam's sin, it is cancelled by the universal resurrection. So far as moral death followed, it is cancelled by the moral resurrection of the Christian.

The efficacy of baptism here becomes important. Just as S. John regards eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ not as an action outside the range of faith, but as a culminating act of faith, so S. Paul regards baptism as a process involving a most thoughtful exercise of faith. In the act of baptism, in which the convert disappeared for a moment under the water, he sees a picture of dying to sin, and in his reappearance from the water he sees a picture of a moral resurrection. The believer is immersed into the death of Christ in order that he may be united with the present life of Christ. He ought to lead and can lead a new life, because in this baptism his sins have been forgiven and he has been brought into a vital connexion with Christ. The result of faith appropriating the remission of sins in baptism is not a metaphorical but a real union between Christ and the Christian. Thus the great blessing of the work of Christ is not that it dispenses us from every kind of death, but that it enables us, first, to die rightly—that is, to be as though we were too dead for sin to attract us; and, secondly, to live the life of a 'new creature.' This does not mean that we redeem ourselves. Quite the contrary. It implies that by ourselves we have no adequate resources to do away with either the guilt or the power of sin. Our own gratitude to God, important as it ought to be, will not destroy sin within us. Only union with

a risen, living Christ can do this. The redeemed will be drawn back into the stream of sin, unless he is 'in Christ' and Christ in him. The sinner's absolution is no fiction, nor is it a capricious pardon won from culpable indulgence; it rests upon the righteousness of Christ, to which the believer adheres and which he appropriates. The risen Christ is a 'life-giving Spirit,' and from Him new powers radiate into the Christian soul. With these new powers the empire of sin and law and 'the flesh' is ended. The convert begins 'to live by the Spirit' and 'walk by the Spirit.' Christ's redeeming work, so far from being exhausted by His death, or even by His death and resurrection together, takes place in each soul progressively as it believes, accepts baptism, and lives in communion with Christ. Such a man no longer regards any external law as a method of obtaining righteousness, though he fulfils all the just claim of the Law (*Romans* viii. 4); he no longer obeys 'the flesh,' and he finds his own moral death abolished, and physical death transformed.

In the above sketch of S. Paul's doctrine we have already in some measure answered the question as to whether S. Paul regards the death of Christ as a substitution for our punishment by God. He does regard it as such, if by this we mean that Christ by freely dying for us showed God's condemnation of all human sin, set our lives free from the power and the guilt of sin, and in this way removed the wrath of God. But S. Paul does not say that Christ died our death, either in the sense of (i) exempting us from physical death by His dying, or (ii) saving us from the moral discipline of personally dying to sin, or (iii) suffering the pains of God's wrath and the torments of hell, according to a theory once prevalent in Protestant theology, or (iv) suffering a penalty which was as punishment equivalent to the punishment which would otherwise have been exacted from sinners. This last form is

that in which the theory of a penal substitution frequently survives in modern Protestant theology, but it is not really Pauline.

When we reject all theories which represent our Lord as having suffered what He did not suffer, we must remember that the pains endured in sympathy may be as great as any pains inflicted as a personal punishment. This fact will be considered more fully in the next section.

§ 3. *Christ as 'Sin' and 'Curse.'*

There are two difficult and important passages which lead us deeper into the mystery of our Lord's Passion. (*a*) S. Paul says that 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf' (2 *Corinthians* v. 21). What does this mean? First, it does not mean that God the Father made the Son to sin, or that He regarded Him as personally guilty and blameworthy. The very idea of such a thing is horrible, and is totally inconsistent with S. Paul's teaching about the Person and work of Christ. Secondly, it does not mean that our Lord was regarded as the personification of sin, that the Father by a fiction transferred the whole sin of the world to His Son and punished all this mass of sin by the Crucifixion. The Greek employed by S. Paul disposes of such a theory. For if S. Paul had meant that our Lord became sin personified, he would have been obliged to say that He was made 'the sin' on our behalf.

By saying that our Lord 'knew no sin,' S. Paul means that He was conscious in Himself of being guiltless. If He was, then, conscious of being sinless, He could not have endured the torments of a guilty conscience. Shakespeare's marvellous description of the tormented conscience of King Richard III. gives us some idea of a human mind tortured by the recollection

of innumerable acts of wrongdoing. The man tempted to revenge himself upon himself, feeling that he loves himself too much to take this revenge, feeling that he hates himself for hateful deeds which he has himself committed, hearing the thousand tongues of his conscience, every tongue bringing a separate tale, knowing that he is unpitied and finding in himself no pity for himself,—such is the man who knows sin as his own. And if any such transfer of human guilt to Jesus Christ had taken place, as some theologians have imagined, we could suppose that such would have been the miseries of our Lord in Gethsemane and on the Cross. But S. Paul has no such idea as this. Sin was not the character of Jesus Christ, though it was His mantle. He chose to live and to die in the midst of the conditions and miseries which sin had created. He chose to endure sufferings which naturally belong to us, but were in no way deserved by Him. He did this 'that we might become the righteousness[1] of God in him,' *i.e.* that we might enter into so close a mutual fellowship with Christ that God regards us as His accepted people.

Can we form to ourselves any picture of what S. Paul meant when he says that the Father made Christ 'sin'? I believe that we can, more especially if in our own experience we have known some heroic action done for the sake of saving a very sinful soul. Let us suppose the case of a good man for the love of God going to a house of vice in order to rescue one of those whom our Lord did not cast away in spite of their defilement. And let this man, young, perhaps, and very sensitive, not only go into an atmosphere which to him is unspeakably odious and sickening, but do it although his friends and neighbours put the very worst construction upon his action, 'reckoning him among

[1] The word 'righteousness' here means the state of being forgiven and accepted by God.

the transgressors.' Such a one might be truly said to bear the sin of the one whom he tries to rescue. Let us further suppose that for the sake of the life that is to be won back to peace and purity, the father of this man consents that his son should, as he desires it, undertake this work. Such a father might derive a profound joy from the action of a son so worthy of confidence and so courageous. Yet the father makes his son, not to sin, but to suffer as though he were a sinner.

Now, we might possibly have conceived of Christ's bearing our sins, Christ being made sin, without dying. But 'Christ died for our sins.' And S. Paul holds that it is, above all, in His dying that our Lord was made sin. He had chosen to enter into a life which was one of a victim to sin, injustice, ingratitude, false friendship, formalism, scepticism. And He shrank from nothing which that sin involved. It brought Him to death. And when our Lord met death He met an experience which sin has made morally terrible, for the 'sting of death is sin.' Though He could not know the sting of personal sin, He knew the sting of the sins of others; and He voluntarily entered into a loneliness which for a time left Him without any consolation, even from His Father.

No man who is in the habit of reflecting faces death with indifference. It is true that many people seem to die without any great agitation, but that in no way proves that death did not previously appear to them as a solemn, lonely agony. Great physical weakness and great mental suffering will sometimes make death appear to be a welcome friend; but death, which even from a materialist's and an atheist's point of view is serious enough, is to a religious man more serious because he knows that it leaves him quite alone with God. To be alone with the Father would have been an experience which had no terror for the im-

maculate soul of Jesus; but to feel unaided, deserted by God was anguish, an anguish which in some degree has been experienced by some great servants of God. This anguish of desolation, whether in life or in death, has a disciplinary meaning and also a penal meaning. It is disciplinary because if endured with humility and patience it results in new strength and new confidence in God. It is also in our case penal because it is the natural and inevitable punishment of sin, both in the race and in the individual, though it is not penal in the sense of being the payment of a mere retribution. So long as a human character is capable of being remedied, all punishment is remedial. And our Lord in resolving to die resolved that He would submit to a withholding of the light of God from His soul, which was the nearest approach which He, being sinless and uncondemned, could in His sympathy make towards dying our death. And it is because He died thus, died as our representative, and for us, that the 'love of Christ constraineth us.'

(*b*) S. Paul tells the Galatians that 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us' (*Galatians* iii. 13). Here again the Greek employed by S. Paul forbids us to say that Christ was personally cursed. His sufferings were not literally co-extensive with the condemnation which the Law pronounces upon a breach of the Law, any more than they were co-extensive with the wrath of God, a wrath which is still being gradually revealed upon the countless offences against morals and religion of which mankind is guilty (*Romans* i. 18). The apostle quotes from *Deuteronomy* xxi. 23 the words, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' The fact that the original meaning of this text in the Old Testament is somewhat obscure is not a matter of great importance, for we know its general drift. The malefactor was hung not in order to be executed, but

after execution as an additional disgrace. The hanging of the unburied corpse on the gallows was an exposure before God and man, a public proof that the adequate penalty had been paid for a crime, and the sign to all beholders of the curse of God resting upon the offender. This may be taken for granted without further discussion. And S. Paul's purpose in quoting this verse to the Galatian Christians is this: Under the influence of false teachers they had accepted the theory that if they were circumcised and observed the requirements of the Jewish ceremonial law, they would place themselves in the position of children of Abraham, and share in the special blessing promised by God to Abraham. The apostle, in order to show them that they are under a delusion, points out that Abraham was accepted by God, not because he observed certain ceremonies, but because he had faith towards God. To observe the Law and to forsake faith will not bring upon the Galatians a blessing, but a curse. For the Law itself pronounces a curse upon all who do not fulfil everything that is included in the Law. He says, in fact, that if they wish to be saved by keeping something of the nature of a legal contract, they must fulfil that contract with minute exactness or they will fall under the curse written in the Law. They will also make the work of Christ useless, for Christ died under the curse of the Law.[1] He therefore, as He was suffering as the representative of all mankind, broke the power which the Law exerted against mankind. Henceforth the Messianic inheritance of the Jews and the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit are open to Gentiles and Jews alike on the condition of faith.

[1] S. Paul avoids saying that Christ was cursed by God, and alters the text in *Deuteronomy* to suit his purpose. He probably does this on the ground that the Law is not the expression of the whole mind of God, like the Gospel, but only the expression of one great aspect of God's mind.

But we have to ask how Christ was under the curse of the Law, and therefore in some measure under the curse of God. It is possible to make the most and to make the least of this passage. To make the most of it is to say that Christ actually endured the punishment, 'the curse,' upon all human sins, which S. Paul does not say, and which is inconsistent with the Greek expression that he employs. To make the least of it is to maintain that S. Paul speaks of the death of Christ as involving a curse *merely* because the manner of it was by suspension on the cross. This is practically to make the word 'curse' equivalent to the word 'crucified.' It would imply that our Lord would not have become a 'curse' if He had died in any other way. This would be as false an argument as to maintain that our Lord would not have been numbered among the transgressors if He had not been crucified between two thieves. It is true that S. Mark says that the Scripture was fulfilled by the fact that He was crucified between two thieves, but the prophetic reference to the fate of the Servant of the Lord would have been fulfilled if our Lord had been crucified alone. S. Paul, if we study his teaching as a connected whole, can unmistakably be seen to imply much more than that our Lord became a curse merely by hanging upon a tree. He means that our Lord suffered as though He were a representative sinner undergoing the displeasure of the Law. According to the Law a heinous offender is under a curse, and a testimony is borne to the reality of this curse when his body is hanged aloft. And so our Lord in dying endured what His Crucifixion testified—namely, the lot of a heinous sinner, so far as He could do so without being guilty. He died a violent death, and He consented to die, fully conscious of, and assenting to, the divine displeasure which the Law manifests against sinners, and, in fact, against the whole human race of which Christ had become Himself a

member. And this consent to die thus, means our redemption if we associate ourselves with Him. S. Paul must certainly have meant that our Lord was made a curse just in so far as He was made sin, neither more nor less. And here it is a satisfaction to quote some words by a celebrated old Calvinist divine. The injury which Calvinism has done to Christianity is now so generally recognised in Great Britain and America that we have sometimes become less than just towards both those truths which Calvinism distorted into falsehoods and those representations of the truth which pious Calvinists have written. Some of the words by which Jonathan Edwards, the great master of the Calvinism of the eighteenth century, represents our Lord's relation to the divine wrath are, I believe, true, though he narrows the love of God for 'the world' until it means the love of God for 'the elect.' He says that our Lord had a perfect perception of the hatefulness of sin, and of the wrath which sin deserves, and 'Christ suffered the wrath of God for men's sins in such a way as He was capable of, being an infinitely holy person, who knew that God was not angry with Him personally, knew that God did not hate Him, but infinitely loved Him.' And, again, 'Christ's love brought His elect infinitely near to Him in that great act and suffering wherein He specially stood for them, and was substituted in their stead; and His love and pity fixed the idea of them in His mind, as if he had really been they; and fixed their calamity in His mind, as though it really was His.'[1] Thus, just as Christ, when He died under the weight and pressure of our sin, seeing sin and sinners as they are in all their foulness and ingratitude, and yet, loving every sinner with a perfect love, made our case His own; so it was with our curse. Our Lord's soul was the only human soul

[1] *Works*, vol. ii. p. 574 f. (London, 1840).

which realised all the evil of sin and fully understood its punishment. He realised the misery as well as the malignity of sin; He knew that its punishment is not a mere external infliction of a penalty, but an inward corrosion of the character; He knew that to be left with sins unrepented and never put away is to be not only tainted but rotten, without faith, without hope, *without God*. That is the curse of the Law; it is to be undelivered from 'the body of this death' of which S. Paul wrote in words of fire. And our Lord, as He understood all its awfulness, felt the curse as attaching to that human race of which He chose to be a member, and for which, in profound love, He died. The ineffable peace of His soul was lost in a misery and horror which S. Paul sums up by saying that He was made a curse. And it is not S. Paul's fault that this grave warning against an easy, good-natured view of moral evil has been called unethical or juristic, or described by any other epithet which implies that he did not understand the heart of Jesus and the heart of sinners.

To sum up the teaching of these two verses: They teach us that Christ conquered the Law at the precise point where He was its victim. (i) Himself sinless, He was treated as a sinner in order that sinners might become righteous, and no longer vainly seek righteousness by the Law. (ii) He chose to die by crucifixion, a death which in Jewish eyes was symbolical of God's curse. (iii) In dying He realised God's curse or condemnation upon human sin, and realised it as a means of relieving us from it. As His perfect human soul entered into the deepest experience of the meaning of our sins, it entered into the deepest knowledge of the distance between the sinner in his sinning and God in His holiness.

§ 4. *S. Paul's Doctrine is ethical.*

The above doctrine of S. Paul is thoroughly coherent and supremely moral. Its moral character can at once be tested by the questions which it raises. They are such questions as: Do I so believe in the essential Deity of Jesus Christ as to see in His love the expression of the love of God for me? Do I accept His loyalty and obedience to the Father as the only adequate reparation for my own disobedience and the perfect pattern of self-sacrifice which I wish to imitate? Do I feel towards Him that faith which makes Him to me personally a 'means of propitiation,' cleansing away my sins? Do I enter into His horror and hatred of sin and His desire to save others from its power? Every aspect of S. Paul's doctrine touches men's own moral life. It is perfectly true that the death of Christ is to S. Paul profoundly mysterious. It would be strange if it were otherwise, for there is something mysterious in the death of even the weakest and youngest member of the human race. But the death of Christ has a moral meaning infinitely deeper than the death of any lower martyr and hero, and those who first preached His Gospel were fully persuaded that this is the case. The death of some great hero may have few points of contact with those whose circumstances and difficulties are on a different plane. But the death of Christ has a moral meaning for every man. A little child can understand that the heart of its meaning is love and obedience, and that God who has loved him always, wishes him to be like Jesus. And the wisest of us are never likely to find such words too simple.

The wish to be like Christ, and the wish to be 'in Christ,' with all the same motives and interests as Christ, is Faith. The word 'Faith' has been made pitifully mean and narrow in much modern religious

teaching. It has been made to signify little more than an intellectual assent to a divine message, or an acquiescence in the doctrine that Christ suffered in our stead. It has been represented as antagonistic to reason, a theory which the New Testament tacitly but quite plainly excludes; and it has been represented as distinct from the good works which really promote its life. It is simply extraordinary that any one should have supposed that S. Paul believed that Faith was not an active principle or that he regarded good works with distrust. His contention is that man cannot gain acceptance with God, be regarded as just, by endeavouring to keep the precepts of the Mosaic Law, or any law but that of faith. Law as law does not inquire into motives; it is only concerned with actions, and it requires actions to be done with absolute exactness. It never penetrates to the heart of a man's character, and at the same time it brings him into condemnation if he fails to carry out the smallest of its requirements. On the other hand, Faith does penetrate to the heart of character, and the more deeply because it brings joy with it, the joy of freedom and of hope. It has a work to do, and does it; it includes the pursuit of truth, and involves subjection to the righteousness of God.

And the man who has faith, who believes in Christ, is justified, acquitted as righteous. The phrase is one of legal origin, which S. Paul was apparently compelled to use in dealing with Jewish or Judaising opponents. When he is not defending Christianity against this particular form of opposition, he prefers to use other phrases. But he uses the word with an essentially ethical meaning. It is to explain that man is forgiven and accepted by God not on a legal basis but because of a moral choice.

§ 5. *Later Epistles of S. Paul.*

We should be wrong in closing an account, however brief, of S. Paul's doctrine of the Atonement, if we ignored his later Epistles. To the end of his life Christ is all in all to him. He thinks of Christ and Christ always, he is literally possessed by Christ. In the Epistles to Timothy and Titus we have quite simple references to the Atonement, references which take the doctrine for granted. And yet it is remarkable that these three Epistles contain in historical order three of the chief points in the doctrine. First, the apostle says in 1 *Timothy* ii. 5 that there is 'one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.' Secondly, we have in *Titus* ii. 14 the essentially Biblical thought that redemption is primarily not a rescue from punishment, but from 'all iniquity,' into purity and good works. And, thirdly, in the latest Epistle that we possess, written when the apostle was in expectation of death, we find him expressing the conviction that his own sufferings are 'for the elect's sake,' and his confidence that 'if we died with him (Christ), we shall also live with him' (2 *Timothy* ii. 11).

Far more elaborate is the doctrine which is implied in the great Epistles which S. Paul wrote during his first captivity in Rome. That to the Philippians has a doctrinal passage of supreme moral beauty, chiefly concerned with the whole humiliation of the Son of God in the act of being incarnate and assuming a servile state on earth. But those to the Colossians and Ephesians add new ideas concerning the death of Christ. It is hardly necessary to say that the apostle, in writing as he does, has in each case a practical end in view. The *Epistle to the Colossians* is written in opposition to a corrupt theology. The Church, so far as we can judge from this letter, had been invaded by a form of

Judaism tinged with Oriental dualism of a Gnostic character. It was not the robust and definitely Semitic Judaism which had threatened the Galatians, but a more decadent religion. It affected Jewish ceremonies and employed the catchwords of Greek culture. And like much of the Gnosticism of later times, it regarded a wholesome use of God's material gifts as unspiritual and profane. It also resembled Gnosticism in inserting intermediate beings, who were neither gods nor men, between the world and the Almighty. It is not quite clear whether these mediators were supposed to be angels such as the Jews of this period specially venerated, or spiritual emanations from God in whom this or that divine attribute was personified.

S. Paul attacked the whole system, root and branch, by showing that there could be no room and no work for such mediators. God's qualities are not detached and resident in separate beings. The whole complex of His attributes dwells bodily in Christ. The universe as a system exists in Him (*Colossians* i. 17). He is its immanent cause and the source of its life and coherence. He is 'the image of God' (*Colossians* i. 15), the Counterpart and Revealer of the Father, and all creation, all revelation and reconciliation, are effected through the Son. Christ is the Person with whom we have to do whenever we think of any of those events. 'For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his Cross; through him, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens' (*Colossians* i. 20). This last expression seems to imply the hostility of certain angelic beings to God (cf. *Ephesians* vi. 12). And though the apostle says very little to explain what he means by such hostility, it is clear that he means to teach that as Christ is the image of God, containing all the fulness of the Godhead, His redemptive work is

absolute and final. Experience teaches us what reconciliation mankind needs. What reconciliation is needed by any other ranks of creatures we cannot adequately know. But either the whole Christian conception of Christ is false, or no creature can be reconciled except through Christ. And this is the special truth that S. Paul wishes to emphasise.

And as both creation and redemption are the work of the same Person, S. Paul points out a practical result. It is that there must be no such abstinence from material created things as would imply that creation is evil. In the next century Celsus, the great Neo-Platonist philosopher, derided Christianity as 'body-loving.' Like some modern Hindus, he regarded it as cherishing physical life too much. He assumed that matter was an evil thing, the body to be hated, and 'meat and drink' despised as much as possible. This theory S. Paul holds to be incompatible with the religion of the Incarnation. It is false to represent him as opposed to all asceticism. The mortification or 'making dead' of sinful inclinations is an essential part of his Christianity (*Colossians* iii. 5). He himself acted upon the conviction that outward bodily mortification may be strictly necessary for the maintenance of a healthily mortified character (1 *Corinthians* ix. 27). But he would not grant that the favourite type of Oriental asceticism was real asceticism, but rather held that it encouraged just that temper of mind which the true ascetic overcomes. The purpose of his own voluntary mortification was to develop the life 'hid with Christ in God.' And the purpose of enduring the sufferings which God sent him was to draw souls to God. He says 'I fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church' (*Colossians* i. 24). These words do not impugn the solitary efficacy of Christ's death. They do not contradict the

thought suggested in his previous indignant question, 'Was Paul crucified for you?' (1 *Corinthians* i. 13). But they do imply that there is an apostolate of suffering as well as an apostolate of work. As Christians are Christ's 'members,' the feet and hands of Christ by which He comes to seek and save the lost, so all their sufferings in His cause are an exaltation of the Holy Cross. They are not the propitiation for the sins of the world, but they increase the possibility of its application.

The conception of Christ as One who unifies all things is developed in the *Epistle to the Ephesians.* In Rome, the great city which for centuries had been subduing and unifying nation after nation, S. Paul becomes inspired to speak of the purpose of God to 'sum up all things in Christ' by means of one divine society. To 'sum up' in Christ all that has become disorganised and disconnected like the scattered fragments of a unique poem, is the end to which all God's dispensation is directed. This unity is effected at the price of Christ's blood. Christ is 'the Beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses' (*Ephesians* i. 7). This is stated by the apostle before he begins his great theme, and near the end of the Epistle, when he is giving simple practical advice to his readers, he says 'Walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us' (*Ephesians* v. 2). But the death of Christ did more than secure the forgiveness of individual believers; it is the ground of the existence of a new society which is a visible union of men realising their highest good in reciprocal actions animated by love (*Ephesians* i. 23; iv. 15, 16). The Ruler of the universe is the Head of the Church; and Christ died not only for the individual, but for the Church. 'Christ loved the Church, and gave himself up for it' (*Ephesians* v. 25), are words which are the counterpart of S. Paul's

centre words 'He loved me, and gave himself up for me' (*Galatians* ii. 20).

Before the Church could be created, two things were necessary, the breaking down of 'the middle wall of partition' between Jew and Gentile, and the reconciling of them both in one body unto God through the Cross (*Ephesians* ii. 15, 16). This was the essential preliminary. But it was not all. The Ascension and the gifts which Christ gave to man after the Ascension continued what was then begun. Our approach to the Father is not only by the Way of the Cross, but also by the Mount of the Ascension. Among the endowments then bestowed was that of a ministry created 'unto the building up of the body of Christ' (*Ephesians* iv. 12); and the existence of both this body and its ministry depends upon the Holy Spirit. It is through Christ that the members of the Church have access unto the Father, but this access is 'in one Spirit,' and there is 'one body' as truly as there is one Spirit (*Ephesians* ii. 18; iv. 4). In considering the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we shall have occasion to study what Christ now does for the Church. But at present let us be content to notice that S. Paul regards this visible and universal Church as the special creation and triumph of Christ's death.

It would have been well if Christians had kept this truth closer to their hearts. It is undoubtedly part of the Gospel that it has the power to call out and sanctify all the best characteristics of every separate nation on the face of the earth. There is nothing necessarily misleading in the term 'a national Church.' But there is always some danger lurking near the term. The Biblical idea of a local Church as part of the one universal Church is sometimes replaced by the idea of a racial Church or an imperial Church, acting independently of the belief and authority of the whole Church. To the Christian mind such an idea as this ought to be

intolerable. The idea of a merely racial Church is Judaism; the idea of an imperial Church is Roman paganism. In Christ there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: and the Cross is the meeting-point of all nations which in one Body are to have access to the Father. And as the Cross is the rebuke of nationalism in religion, so also it is the rebuke of individualism. It has sometimes happened that the men who have cared greatly for the conversion of individual souls, have cared little for 'the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints.' S. Paul cared supremely for both. He knew that the home of the Atonement must be and is an organised society, and not a precarious fellowship which men may touch and leave. And some who have been rightly certain that the Church is no creature of policy, but a divinely commissioned and divinely privileged institution, have not always cared for the penitence and the growth of the individual. There has been a false ecclesiasticism as well as a false justification by faith. They have been false because they have been disunited. It might have been otherwise: S. Paul knew that it might be otherwise; and Christ died that it might be otherwise.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ATONEMENT IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

The author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* has been called 'the schoolman of the New Testament.' And this title will not offend any one who knows the culture of the best schoolmen, and their religious zeal in employing the best learning of their time in the service of Christianity. Being a schoolman, whose copious reasonings imply a whole groundwork of Jewish and Christian traditions, he does not belong to the early springtime of Christianity. He writes at a time which is later than the period of S. Paul's Epistles. He and his readers belong to the second generation of Christians (ii. 3), and his knowledge of S. Paul's theology, and especially that of his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, is almost indubitable. And yet he must have been, roughly speaking, a contemporary of some of the apostles. His Epistle is certainly quoted in the letter of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, *c.* A.D. 97. And it is not likely that a bishop of the Roman Church would have used the Epistle in an official document if the author had been obscure and the Epistle recent. During the few last years a date not long previous to A.D. 90 has been vigorously advocated. But no decisive evidence can be produced for this comparatively late date. The date is probably A.D. 66. The allusions to persecution and trials are natural if understood to refer to a time

subsequent to Nero's first persecution, and just previous to the beginning of the Jewish war. And, above all, the imminent danger lest the rank and file of the Christians here addressed should relapse into Judaism seems incredible if the Epistle was written after A.D. 70. In that year Jerusalem was destroyed. And though for some time to come the Jews continued a keen propaganda, the attraction of Jewish sacrificial worship was a thing of the past. And it is on worship that the writer of this Epistle lays a special stress. He is not concerned with a mere propaganda of Jewish Monotheism, or with the legalism that could be practised after the Temple was a ruin. He is writing to instil courage and perseverance into men who felt that the ancient worship was a consoling reality. Against this strong argument for an early date the plea is sometimes urged that the Epistle criticises, not the worship of the Temple, but that of the Tabernacle. Such a plea fails to estimate the courage and ability of the inspired writer. To show that the worship of the Tabernacle was inferior to the Christian sacrificial worship, was the boldest and most successful method of proving the inferiority of the Temple worship. The liturgy of the Temple was merely a reproduction of the liturgy which the Mosaic law prescribed for the Tabernacle. The author of the Epistle assumed, as his readers assumed, that the ceremonial of the Tabernacle was based on a direct command given by God to Moses (viii. 5). And he devotes himself to proving that as Christ is greater than all prophets and angels, and even Moses, so His priesthood superseded all that Moses instituted. The Church possesses in heavenly verity all that the old system presents in earthly symbol. Christianity is the final and absolute religion. If Jerusalem had been a ruin when the Epistle was written, the author would have had in his hand a potent weapon for proving that

Judaism had only been intended by God to pave the way for Christianity. The fact that he uses no such weapon, and that his readers are evidently under the spell of a ritual which tempts them to revert to their old life, seems conclusive. The value attached to this Epistle before the close of the first century confirms our belief that the author belonged to the circle of S. Paul. That he was S. Barnabas, is a conjecture which at least has several indications in its favour.

§ 1. *Christ and His Sacrifice.*

The purpose of the author is to persuade his readers to remain faithful to Jesus Christ. He therefore strives to show them how unique He is in greatness, and desires them to consider Him attentively before they decide whether they can really bear to part with Him. It is no exaggeration to say that his conception of our Lord is so thoughtful, luminous, and pathetic, that it is fit to be set beside that of S. John. We cannot do justice to it when we abbreviate his words; and we can here only refer to certain aspects of his teaching which enable us to enter more deeply into his doctrine of Christ's sacrifice.

Almost as clearly as any defender of the faith in the days of Arianism, he represents Jesus Christ as truly God and perfectly man. In contrast to the prophets, stands the Son. He who is the Son of God by nature, showed himself as the Son of God by sacrifice. In an opening passage which shows a remarkable parallel to the doctrine in the *Epistle to the Colossians* (i. 15-17), the Son is spoken of as the effulgence or outshining of God's glory, the impress of His substance, and the Sustainer of the universe. The first title implies that the Son is the reflection of the attributes of a God who reveals himself. The second, that God's essence is perfectly expressed in Him. The third, that He supports

the order of all created things. It is also asserted that through His agency God created the world. The author's quotations from the Old Testament make it evident that it was natural to him to think of Christ as 'Lord' and 'God,' the titles which the Jews gave to Jehovah. Here, as in all the higher theology of the New Testament, it is taught that there is a power of the divine nature whereby the Father is able to reveal Himself outwardly in the life of all creation, and then fully and perfectly in the created human nature of Jesus Christ. God enters into creation, He communicates himself to creation in the Person of His Son, and through this same expression of Himself the creation is to find its way to rest and peace with God.

How was the final revelation made? In a filial life of perfect love. Faith, obedience, reverent fear, suffering, development through suffering, are the marks of Him who was from eternity the living impress of the uncreated Father. An enthusiastic emphasis is laid upon the fact that He endured all that we endure, sin apart. Having taken flesh and blood, He made common cause with men, and became in all things like to them whom He henceforward regarded as His brethren (ii. 17). He passed through temptation and tears and death. He experienced 'days of his flesh' in which He learned human agony from within. His human cry to the Father was answered because of the reverent fear with which He met what God ordained. He was perfected for His saving work by the discipline of His sufferings. So He manifests the very highest stage of probation and of sympathy, and is the Representative of man to God. For Him this involved a great but willing humiliation. It is an honour to man to be 'a little lower than the angels'; but the Incarnation caused Him whom the angels worship to become lower than His worshippers.

Our Lord thus possesses one of the two essentials of

the high priestly office. Truly Man, He is able to enter with full sympathy into the lot of erring man. He can 'be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.' He also possesses the other essential, for He was divinely appointed. He who proclaimed Him to be His Son, declared Him a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (v. 5, 6). In the reality of His human experience and sympathy, and in the fact of His divine vocation, He resembled the Levitical priests. But He also differed from them. They were sinful: He was sinless. They must offer sacrifice for themselves: His offering is solely for others. They served a temporary sanctuary: He ministers perpetually in heaven. Our Lord, moreover, differs from these priests because He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek. The allegorical interpretation which our author puts on the brief mention of Melchizedek, the priest-king of Salem, centres in the solitary and absolute character which the office of Melchizedek bears in the narrative of *Genesis* xiv. 8-20. The significance of his name, and the high dignity of a person to whom Abraham himself paid tithes, do not account for the whole parallel between Melchizedek and Christ. The author notices that Melchizedek simply stands forth in the narrative without any mention being made of his descent, his birth, or his death. No tribal connexion, no earthly genealogy, is quoted to account for his high position. This independence of all human conditions and relations suggests the perpetuity of Christ's priesthood and the eternity of His Person. As there wells through the mind of the writer this ancient fount of inspiration, it strengthens his conviction that the stately Jewish worship has been superseded. With the appearance of the new Priest, the old order has changed.

Let us next consider the nature of Christ's sacrifice.

Our Lord's death on earth was the expression of something which belongs eternally to His own divine

Personality. It was 'through the eternal Spirit that he offered himself without blemish unto God' (ix. 14). This does not refer to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, but to the divine Personality of our Lord Himself, as in *Romans* i. 3, 4; 1 *Timothy* iii. 16; and probably *S. John* vi. 63; 1 *Corinthians* xv. 45; 2 *Corinthians* iii. 18. His death was the free consenting act of His divine Personality; as such it possessed an absolute and supreme moral worth, and as such it represents an eternal law in the divine Being, the law of self-surrender. It is the expression of an eternal longing in God to overcome our alienation from God, and hence atonement really reveals what God is. In ancient times, after much discussion, the Catholic Church sanctioned as a lawful expression the phrase 'One of the Holy Trinity was crucified for us.' And though the phrase was sometimes misused, it did call attention to the truth that the work of our Lord cannot be understood as something apart from the life of the Holy Trinity. It was the outcome of an eternal purpose, and that purpose is part of the very nature of God.

The sacrifice of Christ had the following great characteristics: (*a*) It was perfectly spiritual. It was 'the last and consummate expression of a perfectly obedient will.' Throughout our Lord's human life He could truly say, as He is recorded to have said by S. John (iv. 34), 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.' He obeyed the will of God to the last extremity. He had before His Incarnation announced through a Psalmist certain words which in their literal force and beauty could only be true of Himself, the perfect Representative of humanity. 'When he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body didst thou prepare for me: . . . Lo, I am come to do thy will, O God' (*Hebrews* x. 5-7). And by this voluntary oblation, the oblation on which St. Anselm lays such stress in his noble treatise

Cur Deus Homo, Christians 'are sanctified.' It should be noticed that this deeply inward and spiritual sacrifice in no way excludes an external and physical sacrifice. On the contrary, it implied 'the offering of the body of Jesus Christ' (x. 10), and this human body of our Lord was prepared in order to make the complete sacrifice possible. That transcendent interest which attaches to every sorrowful detail of our Lord's Passion, is due to the fact that all the suffering was voluntary, and every pain was the expression of a perfect will which had the power to decline the trial but chose for our sakes to endure it. The conception which we find in *Ephesians* v. 2, is here stated fully and completely. S. Paul himself thought of our Lord's death from the point of view of an Old Testament sacrifice freely given, and the author of this Epistle strengthens this conception by the complete view that he takes of the priestly character of the Messiah. The New Covenant needed better sacrifices than the old (ix. 23), and the sacrifice that the Messiah offered was indeed better than the blood of bulls and goats. They could not offer a rational will to God. He could and did. But we must not forget that God required the shedding of the blood of His Son as the consummation of the offering of His will.

(*b*) The sacrifice of Christ is one. It is not one among many, not one that needs to be repeated yearly. It is unique. The object of sacrifice, to take away sins, has been attained by Christ's death; there is therefore 'no more offering for sin' (x. 18). The Old Testament sacrifices could not attain this end, and the high priests under the law continually offered up sacrifices both for their own sins and those of the people. But Christ offered himself once (vii. 27), and by this one sacrifice is able to 'make perfect' them that draw nigh. Furthermore, the sacrifice not only need not be repeated, but it cannot be repeated. A man dies but once, and

then is judged. And though Christ will not like us be judged, He like us had to experience death once only; and when He comes a second time, it will not be to die, but to complete the salvation of those that wait for Him. The truth that the death of Christ cannot be repeated, must be held in connexion with a fact which we must consider later; namely, that Christ is carrying on a perpetual high priestly ministration in heaven, corresponding with the action of the Jewish high priest who offers the sacrificial blood in the holy of holies (ix. 7). By means of His own blood, Christ entered into the holy of holies. The worth of this blood brought into heaven is estimated by the fact that it is the blood of the Son of God, and the blood that He offered in death. And whereas the Jewish high priests repeated their sacrifices, as though repetition would compensate for the imperfection of each single sacrifice, Christ's one sacrifice delivers from transgressions those who lived under the first covenant as well as those who live under the second (ix. 12-15). His offering is equally valid for all future time and all past time.

(*c*) The sacrifice of Christ is the basis of a new covenant between God and man. The only sacrifice of the old covenant which really could not be repeated, and which the Jews never repeated, was that which established the original relation between God and the Hebrew people. This was a type of Christ's sacrifice. In a manner natural to an Alexandrian writer, the author uses the Greek word διαθήκη in the sense of both *covenant* or alliance, and *testament* or will (ix. 15-18). The sins of God's people having been taken away by Christ, they are all to receive the blessings bequeathed to them by the Messiah and promised in ages past. And as a will only takes effect when the testator dies, so it was necessary for Christ to die that we might enter into our inheritance. By this analogy

the writer hopes to aid his readers to understand that the death of Christ was necessary, if the great blessing of union with God is to be realised. But the idea of a covenant is more fundamental to his argument than the idea of a will. He speaks of the first covenant as not dedicated without blood (ix. 18), and later he expressly calls the blood of the Son of God 'the blood of the covenant' (x. 29). He obviously has in his mind the words spoken by our Lord in instituting the sacrament of His body and His blood. And as the Jewish system required blood for the establishment of the covenant for symbolical cleansing and remission of sins, so the heavenly system, the whole region of man's approach to God, the whole realm of spiritual activities, needed the blood of Christ (ix. 22, 23).

The nature of this great sacrifice, the expression of perfect inward obedience, one and absolute, and the basis of a new covenant between God and man, is summed up by our author at the very beginning of his Epistle. We are there told how the Eternal Son who sustains the organic body of the universe, 'when he had made purification of sins,' sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. He attained to this supreme honour through His work of purifying away the sins of mankind. It is impossible to dissociate this phrase from what in modern language is called an 'objective' doctrine of the Atonement. The writer agrees with all other writers of the New Testament who describe the death of Christ in assuming that there is a real sense in which Christ died as our substitute. Our Lord in dying obeyed not only the whole will of God such as God would have required in an innocent world, but He also fulfilled it as God required in a guilty world. He died, and His death was much more than an event which was 'historically inevitable.' It was inevitable because He willed not to avoid it, but came into this world to endure it. And in enduring

death, He suffered a discipline which is capable of developing everything that is noblest in man's character, but at the same time is a sacrament of God's mind in relation to sin. Our author is here in complete agreement with S. Paul, in spite of a wide difference in his point of view. He stands upon another field in the spiritual landscape of the world. But he sees the same sacred Object. It is Christ dying a death which is historically important as the centre of history, a death which also had the deepest moral meaning for Christ Himself, but has this primary value for us that it is the submission of the sinless Son of God to the great symbol of God's condemnation of our sins. At first sight we say, and say truly, that this is a substitution of the sinless for the sinful. He acted in our name; and we are incapable ourselves of entering perfectly into God's condemnation of our sins, and of perfectly fulfilling His will, even when we acquiesce in it. Christ therefore, and He alone, 'made purification of sins'; but even as we say these words, the thought that Christ is our substitute melts into the other thought that He is our representative. And this is what S. Paul implied when he described Him as the second Adam, and what the author of this Epistle implied when he described Him as our High Priest.

§ 2. *Effects of Christ's Death on Man.*

The effect of Christ's work upon individual human souls is described in various terms by the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. They show the same view of the Atonement as that which we find implied in his description of the actual nature of Christ's offering on Calvary. They completely exclude the view which in modern language is sometimes commended to us as the specially 'moral' view of the Atonement. That is to

say, the author does not for a moment think that the love, wonder, and gratitude, excited by the story of the death of the Son of God, do all the work of reconciling God and man. He says much which is calculated to arouse these feelings, and to give an impetus towards a new and better life. But the relation of the individual towards God is not something which begins when the individual first turns from dead, that is, sinful works, and repents. Such repentance is essential (vi. 1). But every man who repents and is baptized is availing himself of a transaction which is past. He is entering into a situation which has already been created by the death of Christ. Let us consider how this situation is described.

It is made by a purification or *purging* of sins (i. 3), an action already performed, intended for the remission of sins (ix. 22). Man has a conscience, or, as we should say, 'consciousness,' of the sinful character of his own actions and thoughts; and when he is conscious of sins, his conscience may be described as defiled. His conscience is purged (ix. 14), or relieved of a sense of sin, when he knows that he is forgiven. Under the Jewish Law man sought for this purging by the offering of sacrifices and the use of sacrificial blood (x. 2 ff.). So also at the establishment of the covenant, blood was sprinkled to obliterate the uncleanness of the people by a symbol or shadow. Christians, on the other hand, have come 'to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel' (xii. 24). They avail themselves of something which pleads with God for forgiveness, and promises peace to man. They are set free from the sense of guilt when they plead the validity of a covenant which God has made, a sacrifice which has already been offered. Corresponding with the assurance that God forgives us for Christ's sake and the departure of 'an evil conscience,' is the baptism of the body with pure water (x. 22). The

distinction between Jewish and Christian baptism is regarded as something that pertains to a Christian's elementary knowledge (vi. 2); and God's promise to remember his sins no more is one of the great blessings of the new covenant. To be purged or purified therefore primarily means to be forgiven and to lose the consciousness of being guilty.

The second effect of the death of Christ upon the Christian is described by the word *sanctify* (ἁγιάζειν). This word is closely connected with the word purge (καθαρίζειν). The distinction is that the latter refers mainly to the state of a man's own conscience, while the former refers to his relation towards God. Christians are taught to follow after the sanctification without which no man can see the Lord (xii. 14), and the purpose of God's chastisements is said to be that we may be partakers of His holiness (xii. 10). These exhortations imply that progress in holiness is necessary. But although a gradual appropriation of holiness is incumbent upon the Christian, the word 'sanctify' and the word 'holy' primarily refer to a past fact. They mean the 'dedicating' of a 'dedicated' people to the service of God. To 'sanctify' means in Old Testament language to consecrate to God and set apart for His worship. So in x. 10 we are said to have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all; in x. 29 we find the blood of Christ described as 'the blood of the covenant wherewith he (a Christian) was sanctified'; and in xiii. 12 it is written that 'Jesus, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate.' That a real moral effect is implied in all this seems indisputable, and it must be regretted that the ethical meaning of these passages is sometimes seriously understated. To say that the term sanctify 'does not imply destruction of the principle of sin in the heart,'[1]

[1] A. B. Davidson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 207.

is more paradoxical than true. For our author, by a careful use of different tenses, distinguishes between the dedication as an initial abiding fact (*perfect*), as a past fact (*aorist*), and as a continuous process (*present*). By this process the Christian's character gradually becomes conformable to his dedication. Christ and His Church are called 'He that sanctifieth, and they that are being sanctified' (ii. 11, cf. x. 14). But it is implied that before the individual at baptism enters upon the dedicated state, and before he gradually appropriates the holiness which that state implies, Christ made the dedicated state possible. And Christ did this, not merely by showing us what a holy and dedicated life is, but by dedicating Himself to God as a sacrifice. He did not only dedicate Himself as a worshipping Priest, but as a Victim; and this dedication availed potentially for all men. Actually it avails for those who 'enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus' (x. 19), as God's true worshippers.

A third effect of the death of Christ is to *make perfect* (τελειοῦν). Once again the word is not quite identical with the nearest English word. It does not directly mean to make sinless, but to bring to a full enjoyment of sacred privileges. It implies indeed a profound moral effect, but the moral effect is the result of being brought into full fellowship with God by Christ. By one offering He has perfected for ever them that are being sanctified (x. 14). Christ secured for all men who are willing to occupy it, an unimpeachable position in the eyes of God (iv. 16; x. 22). This position of full fellowship between the children and their heavenly Father is described as the condition in which the covenant relationship is realised. To make men perfect is to bring them to an ideal position, to bring them to the highest stage in the sphere which is contemplated. And wherever the word 'perfect' is mentioned in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* it signifies

brought to an ideal end. Thus Christ Himself was made perfect through sufferings (ii. 10); that is, as we see from the context, His sufferings gave Him such an experience of human conditions of life that He became an ideal Author of salvation. Apart from them He could not have adequately represented men and helped men. So again perfection was not through the Levitical priesthood (vii. 11); the Law made nothing perfect (vii. 19); and the Old Testament offerings were unable to make perfect as to the conscience (ix. 9), or make the worshippers perfect (x. 1.). All this means that the old commandments about the priesthood and its worship were only provisional; they did not bring the Israelites to the ideal of worship, that is, true nearness to God. And Christ has brought men to that nearness by an offering which removed the impediment between men and God.

Therefore the three expressions purify, sanctify, and make perfect, all relate to the same thing, though they have different shades of meaning. They mean that the Christian is forgiven, dedicated to God, brought to an ideal position of communion with God by Christ's offering of Himself. In S. Paul's language he has peace with God because he is justified by faith, and he has access to God (*Romans* v. 1.; *Ephesians* ii. 18; iii. 12). In S. Peter's language, Christ died that He might conduct us to God (1 *S. Peter* iii. 18). In S. John's language, Jesus has made us to be a kingdom and priests unto God (*Revelation* i. 6). In our Lord's language, the Christian is able to worship in spirit and truth (*S. John* iv. 23). The New Testament is filled with this consciousness of a new power of worship. This consciousness is expressed in forms which are similar, though not minutely identical, and it has behind it one and the same great experience. The writers knew that sin had cut them off from God; they knew that Christ by dying had taken away the barrier that sin

created, that the love of Christ who died is identical with the love of the Father, and that with Christ they can approach the Father. And the *Epistle to the Hebrews* has this distinctive special value, that it deals with the Atonement from the side of ritual and worship. It is the only book in the New Testament which does so with any completeness. And it is therefore the only book which shows us how the worship of the old covenant was fulfilled and not destroyed by Christ. Real worship is shown to imply nearness to God; and nearness to God is the result of approaching Him 'by the blood of Jesus' (x. 19), and all that the blood implies.

§ 3. *The Ascension.*

The Ascension, the entrance of the Son into heaven 'through his own blood,' as the medium or key which opened the holiest place, is the culminating point of the Atonement as offered to God. The slaying of the victim, and the entering of the high priest into the holiest place with the blood, are parts of one and the same offering, of the same sacrifice. The Jewish high priest did not enter into the holiest in virtue of an offering which was already past, or as if the blood was only a reminder of something past (ix. 7). So Christ's sacrifice was not completed until the blood was 'offered' and received by God within the veil. This is finely expressed in a hymn for Ascension Day in the old Parisian breviary, which has now been laid aside in favour of the Roman breviary:—

> 'Illic Patronus, Pontifex,
> Pacis Sequester, quem tua
> Semel profudit caritas,
> Offerre pergis sanguinem.'

'Eternal redemption' (ix. 12) was obtained for us at

this entrance of Christ into heaven. We were then delivered by the sacrifice made to God. Christ has opened heaven and inaugurated for us an everlasting covenant of worship, in which the fellowship between God and His people is realised. It is a matter of very great interest to compare and contrast our author's teaching concerning the Ascension with that of S. Paul concerning the Resurrection. In S. Paul's teaching the death of Christ completed the Atonement so far as the love of God towards the sinner, and His condemnation of sin required to be manifested. But the Resurrection is essential to that incorporation into Christ which makes the Atonement effective in the believer. And in this Epistle Christ 'tasted death for every man' (ii. 9), and this death was necessary for God's remission of our sins. But His Ascension and entrance into heaven are a necessary part of the Atonement, in order that the Christian people may draw near to God through the blood there offered. One view supplements the other. They are independent but not contradictory. The writers also show other points of contact. For in this Epistle the Ascension is but a further stage of that 'indissoluble life' (vii. 16; cf. xiii. 20) which belongs to the incarnate Son since the Resurrection. And the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which S. Paul lays stress on the Ascension, is the Epistle where the corporate life of the Church and her approach to God are specially emphasised.

The priestly acts of our Lord in heaven belong to the sphere of His 'Melchizedek' priesthood. His possession of this priesthood does not mean that His actions either on earth or in heaven are not on a line with the actions of the Aaronic high priest, but that they all have an eternal significance. They are ideal, and represent the final development of all sacrificial worship. The exercise of this priesthood in the heavenly sanctuary implies a continuous appearance or

manifestation of Himself in the presence of God (ix. 24), and a continuous intercession on our behalf (vii. 25; cf. *Romans* viii. 34). This intercession is a priestly function, and it is apparently implied that through it we are able to offer to God the sacrifice of praise and acts of mercy (xiii. 15). His blood will be continually efficacious in purging men (ix. 14), and we can come boldly to the throne of grace because 'we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (iv. 15). He still remains and acts as our high priest (vi. 20). And because He abideth for ever, He hath His priesthood unchangeable (vii. 23). The conception of Christ's single sacrifice on earth is thus combined with a perpetual atoning work carried on in heaven. The author himself states that the crown of his discourse in part of the Epistle is that a priestly ministry is now exercised by our Lord in the heavenly sanctuary (viii. 1-3). 'Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this high priest also have somewhat to offer.' The special offering to which the offering of Christ corresponds is shown to be the blood which the high priest offered for himself and for the errors of the people (ix. 7). Therefore the 'somewhat' which our Lord has to offer is His blood or life.

The present work of our Lord in heaven is therefore essentially sacerdotal and sacrificial. He sat down on the right hand of God at His Ascension, but He is still an officiating high priest (viii. 1, 2). Now the characteristic work of the high priest within the veil was the offering of the blood or 'life' of the slain victim. So, although there is no repetition, either of Christ's death or of that initial presentation of Himself, which first realised the fulness of the covenant union between God and humanity, His high priestly work is continuous.

His presence on the throne is the continuous offering of the blood or life of His human nature on the mercy-seat. Just as the death of our Lord on Calvary represents to us attributes of a divine Being which were eternally active (above, p. 227), so it is a standing fact for all time. It is past, and cannot be repeated; yet it remains present in its efficacy Godward and in its power of application to the human soul. The continuance of the new covenant would be impossible if it had not this power of being applied to the souls of men. On the Cross and at the Ascension our Lord offered one perfect satisfaction for sin and all the infinite merits of a sacrifice of an absolute and ideal character. We can conceive of nothing beyond it in the way of a response to God's requirements of an offering from man relative to man's sin. No other sacrificing could add to the merit and the satisfaction then offered. But the fulness of this satisfaction does not exclude that kind of offering which pleads for the application of those merits to the souls of men, that they may be forgiven, that they may be freed from the sense of guilt, that they may be able to serve God. And it is such an offering that our Lord makes in heaven, so that men may become not only 'partakers of the heavenly calling,' but actual 'partakers of Christ' (iii. 14). This last phrase warns us how careful we should be in drawing a sharp distinction between the theology of S. Paul and that contained in this Epistle. For though our author speaks so seldom of our union with Christ, he is aware that this union is the substance of the Christian life.

§ 4. *The Christian Altar.*

Much discussion has arisen in connection with the statement, 'We have an altar,' in xiii. 10. The Greek

word *θυσιαστήριον* which is here employed, and is distinct from the word ordinarily used of heathen altars, signifies either a sanctuary of the true God or an altar table of the true God. It is a place at which an offering is made to God, not an object upon which the victim is actually slain (see *Leviticus* i. 11).

The general drift of the preceding verses (vv. 8-9) is obvious; it is an exhortation to Christians to abstain from unchristian doctrines and unchristian ritual observances. These observances are represented as particularly consisting in the eating of unchristian sacrificial food. The author immediately justifies his exhortation by urging that we Christians possess an altar of our own of which those have no right to eat who serve the Jewish tabernacle. The men who attach themselves to the old covenant and partake of the food offered on the altar of the old covenant, may not eat of a certain food offered on the Christian *θυσιαστήριον*. It can hardly be questioned that this discountenances the idea that *θυσιαστήριον* means 'sanctuary'; for if the author had wished to speak of a Christian sanctuary, he would probably have used the Greek word which he uses for the Jewish sanctuary or tabernacle. The word therefore means an altar, as in every other passage where it is employed in the New Testament. The Christian eats of a certain food presented on a real altar, the food and the altar being better than the Jewish food and Jewish altar, belonging, as the writer's whole system of theology implies, to an eternal and perfect system of which Judaism contained only the shadows. When the Jew charges the Christian with being in a position of disadvantage in relation to an aspect of social worship in which the Christian might be expected to feel a disadvantage most keenly, he has his reply ready: 'We have an altar, from which we take the material for our sacrificial feast, our great sin-

offering is given to us as our food, our altar has both a sacrificial victim and food from that sacrifice.'

Let us now turn to the verses which follow. Jesus, we are told, suffered outside the gate of Jerusalem, and the readers of the Epistle are exhorted to go outside the camp of Judaism, knowing that it is not a permanent city. They are to seek the heavenly city which 'is to come,' that is to say, the permanent spiritual fatherland to which the Christian not only aspires, but which he also knows already as his home, a home in some degree present with him now (xii. 22, 23). And through Jesus our High Priest, who is already in the centre of that city, we are to offer a sacrifice of praise. Part of the point of the reply which the Christian can make to the Jew lies in the fact that those who had a right to eat of other Jewish sacrifices, had no share in the sin-offering offered on the Day of Atonement. In that offering the Christian Hebrew discerns two elements: first, its circumstances were prophetic, and Christ fulfilled their prophecy—that He might sanctify the people by His blood, He suffered outside the gate, as the true sin-offering; secondly, the offering on the Day of Atonement was itself symbolical of the truth that those who adhered to the principles of Jewish worship could not have any part in the perfect and true sin-offering. Only outside the camp of Israel is it possible to share in the benefits of the true sin-offering. The Christian enjoys in substance what the Jew has not even in shadow.

So far all is clear. But it does not settle the meaning of the word 'altar.' What is the Christian's altar?

It might be appropriate to give the name of altar to the Cross, in spite of the fact that it was not the Jewish custom to slay a victim upon the altar. This interpretation is that of S. Thomas Aquinas, and is followed by many modern commentators. But to

speak of 'eating' of the Cross would be a very abrupt metaphor to use without further introduction. Moreover, according to the argument here used by the writer (i) the Cross of Christ, which was outside the gate of Jerusalem, corresponds with the place outside the camp where the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement was burnt, *not* with the altar which was in the tabernacle; and (ii) the altar of which the Christian *eats* must be an altar on which his sacred food is now present as food, and not an altar from which the food is now absent. That food is Christ Himself, the Priest and Victim of the eternal system of worship, the Christ of whom we are called 'partakers' (iii. 14), and we have to inquire, On what altar is Christ so present that we can partake of Him? There are some important passages outside this Epistle which give us possible clues. The first is *Revelation* vi. 9. The symbolical altar there mentioned, under which the souls of the martyrs are found, may be the heavenly altar of burnt-offering. Just as the blood, in which was the life (in Greek 'soul') of the sacrificed animal, was poured out at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering on earth, so these martyrs are regarded as offering their lives at the heavenly altar. But the altar mentioned in *Revelation* vi. 9 is more probably the same as the heavenly altar of incense mentioned in *Revelation* viii. 3. Incense and intercession go together. On the golden altar which is before the throne an angel offers the prayers of all the saints. As in the Tabernacle the altar of incense stood outside the veil of the holy of holies, and yet belonged, as the author of this Epistle holds (*Hebrews* ix. 4, cf. 1 *Kings* vi. 22), symbolically to the holy of holies because all intercession was consummated there at the mercy-seat, so it is in heaven.[1] The altar of

[1] It should be noted that on the Day of Atonement the golden altar was treated in the same manner as the holy of holies by the sprinkling of blood.—*Exodus* xxx. 10.

incense is not the throne, and yet it is so near the throne that the smoke 'went up before God.'

This conception of the heavenly altar had a great influence upon Christian belief and worship in ancient times. In the *Shepherd of Hermas*, written about A.D. 140 in Rome, the 'altar' is, according to the imagery of the Apocalypse, that whereon the offerings of men are placed that they may be brought before God. S. Irenaeus, writing in Gaul about A.D. 180, speaks of this heavenly 'altar' in special connexion with the Holy Eucharist. He regards the Eucharist as a sacrifice to God of the first-fruits of the earth, bread and wine, directed by prayer towards the heavenly altar and consecrated to become the body and blood of Christ.[1] The familiarity of S. Irenaeus with such different parts of the world as Asia Minor, Rome, and Gaul, and especially his early training amid the apostolic atmosphere of Asia Minor, give very great weight to his teaching. And we find the survival of this imagery of the heavenly 'altar' in the ancient liturgies. In the very early Greek liturgy of S. James we have the prayer that the Eucharist may be received 'at the holy supercelestial and spiritual altar.' And the later liturgy of S. John Chrysostom, the liturgy now most ordinarily employed in the orthodox churches of the East, contains after the consecration and immediately before the prayer for grace to partake worthily of the 'spiritual table,' a mention of this spiritual altar at which God has already received the consecrated gifts. Equally interesting is that prayer in the Roman canon of the Mass which originally completed the consecration of the sacrament, 'We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these gifts to be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thine *altar on high*, in the sight of Thy divine majesty, that so many of us as are at *this altar* partakers of the precious body and blood of

[1] *Adv. Haer.* iv. 18. 4, 6.

Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace; through the same Christ our Lord.'

These passages have been quoted to show that it may be very reasonably contended that the Christian altar of which this Epistle speaks is the symbolical altar of incense, or the presence of God in heaven where the intercession of the Church is received. But the word 'eat' is against this interpretation, and seems definitely to imply a material altar on earth. Even if the passage refers to the Cross or the heavenly altar, it would be most naturally interpreted as containing an allusion to the Eucharist. But the probability that the doctrine corresponds with that of S. Paul's thought concerning the 'Lord's table' is too strong to be disregarded. S. Paul in 1 *Corinthians* x. 21 is speaking of sacrifices offered to idols, and he warns the Corinthians that they cannot communicate alike in the table of the Lord and the table of demons. It is difficult to believe that the Corinthians were supposed to understand that the latter feast was sacrificial and the former was not. But the question is settled by the fact that the term 'table of the Lord' is taken from the Old Testament and is definitely sacrificial. It means an altar. And the ancient Christian liturgies were strictly Scriptural in using the two terms as different names for the same thing. In the Old Testament a consecrated table, whether Jewish or heathen, is an altar. We find this in *Malachi* i. 7, 12; *Isaiah* lxv. 11 (R.V.) and *Ezekiel* xliv. 16. And of special interest is *Ezekiel* xli. 22, where 'the Lord's table' is explained to be 'the altar of wood' and 'the table that is before the Lord.' If the Christian possesses no altar on earth, he has no 'table of the Lord.' And if we have a 'table of the Lord,' we have an 'altar.' This is what the *Epistle to the Hebrews* declares. And so we return again to the fact that the popular antithesis between a sacrifice and a communion is false.

There is a close parallel between the activity of our Lord at the heavenly throne and His activity and ours at the earthly altar or 'table of the Lord.' Side by side with that clearer perception of our Lord's Incarnation which grew in the minds of the Church during the controversy with Arianism, there grew a clearer perception of the relation of the Eucharistic sacrifice to the atoning work of Christ. That relation may be briefly expressed thus: (i) that Christ as sacrificed is truly and spiritually, though not materially or tangibly, presented before the Father by the Church; 'We always offer Him who is the same,'[1] as S. John Chrysostom says; (ii) that the pleading of His death by the Church is joined with the present sacrificial pleading made by our Lord in heaven; (iii.) that the twofold consecration of the Eucharist is a symbolical renewal, not an actual renewal with blood-shedding, of the separation of the blood of our Lord from His body on the Cross. Thus the *thing* offered is mystically identical with the thing offered on Calvary, being the body and blood of our Lord; but the *act* of sacrificing is, as S. Chrysostom says, a 'memorial of a sacrifice,'[2] and as S. Ambrose specially points out, a co-operation with the heavenly intercession of Christ.[3] If we were to restrict the reality of the Eucharistic sacrifice to the actual moment of consecration, we should be unable to see any close parallel between the heavenly oblation and the oblation of the Eucharist. But the Eucharistic sacrifice cannot be so restricted. The sacrifice includes communion, and the sacrifice continues until it is consummated by the act whereby the Christian people offer themselves to the Divine Father in union with their Lord. Christ the Head, and they, the members of His body, offer themselves together in one 'reasonable service.'

[1] *In Ep. ad Hebr.* c. x. Hom. xvii. §3.
[2] *Loc. cit.* [3] *De Off.* i. 48.

But while our liturgy on earth is on a line with the liturgy in heaven, it is also parallel to the death of Christ on earth in a manner to which the intercession of Christ in heaven shows no parallel. We have no ground for believing that there is or can be in heaven any act of symbolical immolation corresponding with the repeated acts of the twofold consecration on earth. As a result of that consecration we in Holy Communion not only lift up our hearts to Christ in heaven, but also feed on something exhibited to our faith here. The body and the blood of Christ are given to us here in connexion with tangible symbols of the most eloquent kind. They are given to us under conditions which recall a past state—the state of the sacrificial death on the Cross. These conditions witness to the truth that the sinner gains fellowship with the resurrection life of Christ by being made a partaker of His body and blood sacrificed for the remission of sins. But through that death they became endued with an 'indissoluble life.' And the Divine Person who feeds us with His own life is alive for evermore and glorified, so that while we in a figure receive the body and blood as dead, we really and spiritually receive them as living forces of the 'quickening Spirit.' By a spiritual action of the soul, none the less spiritual because it involves an eating by the human mouth of material outward forms, does the believer take and appropriate the body and the blood of Him who died 'without the gate' and ever liveth to make intercession for us in heaven.

§ 5. *Conclusion.*

This Epistle, beautiful and eloquent as it is, will appeal with a somewhat different force to different minds. The author's philosophy and his poetry will seem more persuasive to some readers than to others.

But among Christian men there can be no difference of opinion as to the religious value of his doctrine. This Epistle silences all dispute as to the relative importance of preaching the doctrine of the Incarnation and the doctrine of the Atonement. Nowhere do we see a clearer expression of the truth that because Jesus is what He is, He atones. If Jesus were not 'the effulgence' of the Father's glory, and 'the very impress of His substance,' He would not have made peace between man and God. To teach the Atonement without any clear teaching to the effect that Jesus is 'God of God, Light of Light,' is to encourage the miserable superstition that God looking down from His throne very 'high exalted' selected some beautiful spirit or some holy man to represent Him, and crowned his life of devotion and self-sacrifice by leaving him to suffer like a felon. Anything less fitted to teach us that 'God is love' it would be impossible to conceive. Nothing could more completely freeze our desire to be good. The wonder and the beauty of the Atonement in the eyes of the writers of the New Testament would have vanished if this great exhibition of the righteousness of God had not been an exhibition of God Himself. The Passion of Christ 'comforts' us, because it is a Theophany. It is full of hope and joy to us because we see the Son of God, the very expression of God, all that God could be as incarnate, suffering for our sake, and we know that by His Spirit He will complete within us the work that was in His purpose from all eternity and the method of which He revealed on Calvary.

Again, to preach the Incarnation without the Atonement is not really the preaching of the Gospel. 'Repent ye, and believe in the gospel' (*S. Mark* i. 15) is the earliest recorded command of our Lord. These simple words do not expound a doctrine, but they imply that 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God' had

a direct reference to human sin. And the New Testament never loses touch with real life, because its message always has a direct bearing on human character. In the Middle Ages some of the greatest theologians used to discuss whether the Incarnation depended upon the Fall, whether the Son of God would or would not have come to dwell among us if man had never sinned. The discussion was not so abstract as it might at first appear to be. For the theory that He would have been incarnate if there had been no sin, can be presented in a manner which encourages men to think that they are merely imperfect, needing development and improvement, but not needing repentance. And the theory that He would not have been incarnate if there had been no sin, can be presented in a manner which encourages man to think that Christ only restores what mankind lost by the fall of Adam or by their own personal sins. Such views are very far from the height and depth of the teaching of the New Testament. The sacred writers go to the root of the matter by insisting that we are sinners needing a Saviour. It would be quite true to say that creation might seem incomplete if the Son of God had not shown Himself as Man, and revealed, even if it were in a sinless world, the capacities and the worth of human nature. But, as it was, He came 'for us men, and for our salvation.' Nothing could express the truth better than these words of the Nicene Creed. He came to give us all the development that we require, and He gives us more than we ever lost; but He came not only to develop us, but also to save us from our sins.

Great as the value of this Epistle is in the close link which it forges between the doctrine of the Incarnation and the doctrine of the Atonement, it is of almost equal value in another respect. It contains a profound truth in its view of the religion of the Old Testament. During the last two generations great

attention has been given, and rightly given, to a study of the principle of development in religion. In the most opposite quarters men have studied the origin of religious ideas, the influence of one race or religion upon another race and a different religion, and the relation of the origin of a religious idea to its validity and authority. Ever since the publication of Newman's famous essay in 1845, the investigation has been pursued in one department of Christian theology after another. And no department has been more ardently investigated than that which is devoted to the influence of Judaism upon Christianity. Yet the result has often been more fruitful in collecting objects for a theological museum than in sustaining the religious and intellectual life. The real value of primitive religions and of the Jewish religion is inadequately understood. A somewhat similar mistake was made in earlier times. In the second century of the Christian era the Gnostic sects boldly treated the Old Testament as a millstone round the neck of Christianity and tried to throw it away. They would recognise no real development in religion, and regarded Christianity as a mere reversal of Judaism. Against such an interpretation of the history of religion Catholic Christianity protested. It is quite possible that men like S. Justin Martyr and S. Irenaeus were in some ways less able than the greatest Gnostic teachers. But they saw what the Gnostics failed to see, that to affirm the absolute standard of religion is not to deny relative and lower standards. S. Justin Martyr would pour no scorn either on Socrates or on Moses; and S. Irenaeus strove to teach that the God who created the material world and gave the Jewish law, was none other than the good God revealed to us in Christ.

After the lapse of many centuries we are again confronted with a view of the Jewish Law which approaches the Gnostic one. It is all the more remarkable because

it has issued from schools of thought which have very freely applied the principles of evolution and development to the history of religion. The Levitical laws of sacrifice are treated merely as clouds in 'the night of legalism,' darkening all purer views of God. Scant justice, or no justice, is done to the truth that the legal system deepened the sense of God's holiness and man's unworthiness. In that system no ceremonial sacrifices were regarded as a substitute for moral holiness, and at the same time morality was prevented from degenerating into custom by keeping alive the thought of God's presence. Worship itself was preserved from relapsing into the cheerful but irreverent familiarity with God and the contaminating influence of heathen 'high places,' which had been so easy when every Israelite might kill his own sacrifice and when worship was not definitely centred in Jerusalem. The Levitical Law did in one way what the Hebrew prophets did in another. It made the human conscience more sensitive; and did it, not by merely preaching an ideal of duty which had been taught already, but by carrying into all worship the necessity of the fear of God and freedom from defilement. S. Paul knew what the Law both moral and ceremonial could effect. And he spoke truly when he said that 'the law is spiritual'; quite unable to 'make alive,' but able to educate, inasmuch as 'I had not known sin, except through the law' (*Romans* vii. 7).

More than this, the Jewish Law, and what is true of the Jewish Law is in some degree true of the religious ceremonial of other primitive races, contains a rationale of sacrifice and propitiation. Sacrifice is essentially the giving to God of some gift which expresses our entire dependence upon Him, and propitiation is essentially the 'purification' of sins. Crudely, but quite truly, even the uncivilised Semitic and Latin tribes knew that sacrifice to God was closely connected with a joyous communion between the worshippers and their

deity. Crudely, but quite truly, they often felt that the man who wishes to be purified from sin needs the power of a new life within him, a life which they sought in sacrificial blood. Quite truly the Hebrews came to realise more adequately the difficulty of approaching God, the need of a contrite heart, the solemnity of the work intrusted to the High Priest, who alone and once a year approached the mercy-seat. If we take the apostolic view of Calvary and of the sacraments, we have a real evolution and a true culmination. The course of things, even of teaching and of practices which seem rigidly parallel or definitely opposed, becomes intelligible. The prophets are no longer solitary voices crying in the desert, the priests cease to appear as mere patrons of barbaric religious survivals. Sacrifices and sermons point to one goal, and that goal is Jesus. And believers in a divine Providence who see this evolution, take a more liberal and more enlightened view of Judaism than those who treat the ancient sacrifices as superstition, and regard the language of the New Testament writers about the death of Christ as only decorative metaphor. Nearly all these writers have something new to say about the sacrifice of Christ, and something new is still written on the tablet of every Christian heart. But the witness is always fundamentally the same. It is the same because it is the result of the same experience, the experience that every road to God must sooner or later pass over the hill of Calvary. The way to pardon, to peace, to cleansing, to life, has always lain under the shadow of the Cross. Every soul that has made this journey will be more deeply and tenderly affected by the single thought of Christ crucified than by any other effort of imagination or reflection. And if Christianity is sometimes a failure, it is not because the Cross is preached too much, but because it is preached too little.

SUMMARY

THE Catholic Church as a whole has never given any full definition of the nature of the Atonement, or any definition so complete as that which was found necessary in the case of the kindred doctrine of the Incarnation. The writer of this book believes that the guidance of the Holy Spirit has been manifested in the silences as well as in the utterances of the Church. And he only ventures humbly to state certain principles which he believes to be involved in the teaching of the Bible concerning our redemption. After a long study of the origin and the meaning of the New Testament, he is convinced that certain theories of the Atonement which are now current in England, America, and Germany, are at one point or another essentially unbiblical. Without any adequate reason, they assume that the writers of the New Testament do not mean what they appear to say, or that the books which they wrote are pseudonymous, or that they misrepresent the teaching of Jesus Christ. The result is a theology which is no more adequate for the satisfaction of man's intellect than for the conversion of his character. Against this the New Testament provides us with principles which rest on a sound historical foundation, are coherent in themselves, and are true to spiritual experience.

1. Sin is a form of self-destruction; and it is also a transgression against God, who is the source of

all life, and whose mind toward us is best expressed in the words, 'Our Father.'

2. Physical death is a symbol of God's condemnation of sin, and it corresponds with the nature of sin. It is at the same time capable of being made into a means of all that we most sincerely admire in human character.
3. The sacrificial system of the Old Testament taught in various eloquent ceremonies the truths that man by sacrifice must show his dependence upon God, and recognise that sin deserves punishment, and that sins must be 'atoned for,'—*i.e.* made white or wiped away, by a renewal of life uniting man to God.
4. In the work of reconciling God and man, God takes the whole initiative. He being Love, reconciled us to Himself through Christ. This reconciliation of man to God, and the accompanying offering of Christ to God on our behalf, are made possible by the fact that Jesus is 'the Word made flesh.' As the Son and Word of God, He shows us the divine nature in a human life. There is a solidarity between the Son of God and us even before we will to recognise it. There has been a link of life between each human individuality and Him since the human race was created; and when He was born into the world, He was born as our Representative.
5. Jesus Christ, as the Head and Representative of humanity, showed towards God a perfect filial obedience and dependence, though it involved 'even the death of the Cross' and the withdrawal of God's comfort. This surrender of Himself was both the secret of His human development and a source of infinite satisfaction to the love of God. He entered into all human misery by a profoundly intelligent and

moral sympathy. In proportion to His perfect understanding and perfect holiness, He suffered.

6. The greatest conceivable condemnation of our sins is that He the all-holy 'bore' them. God willed that He should realise, and He chose to realise, the weight of human sin and of God's judgment upon sin, in order that all men might repent, receive entire forgiveness, and become dead to sin.
7. The Resurrection, the Ascension, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, are all essential to the Atonement. Our answer to Christ's love is our faith. It is necessary to make an entire moral surrender to the risen, living Lord, and accept His mind towards sin and goodness. We must associate ourselves with His present intercession on our behalf, and see in His position a guarantee of the Christian's future. We must receive from the Holy Spirit an outpouring of new life, a communication of divine life which changes our own personality, not by suppressing it, but by strengthening it.
8. In this communication of the new life the Sacraments occupy an important place. Baptism is our regeneration, our incorporation into the manhood that is Christ's, an incorporation reinforced by the gifts of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation. And the Eucharist is the means of a repeated communion with the spiritual forces of our Lord's humanity. Through that humanity man gains the communion with God for which he was made, and in which he is supremely blessed.

APPENDIX

THE WORD *KIPPER*[1]

A CONSIDERATION of the true original meaning of the Semitic word which signifies to 'make atonement' is of more than merely historical or philological interest. It bears upon the often repeated error which asserts that there is a chasm between the teaching about the method of obtaining God's forgiveness which we find stated in the Hebrew prophets and that which is laid down in the Jewish sacrificial laws. On the one hand, we have the gracious promise, 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool' (*Isaiah* i. 18). On the other hand, we have an elaborate ceremonialism with a complete *directorium* of raiment, ablutions, actions, and manipulations. Now, the manner in which Ezekiel, a priest among priests, combines precise rules for preserving holiness by a ceremonial method with the simplest moral teaching about salvation (xviii. 27) should put us on our guard. Ezekiel is both a prophet and a priest. Whatever difference lay between the two conceptions with regard to the obtaining of God's forgiveness, Ezekiel was able to bridge it. But he was able to do this because the underlying idea of the atoning sacrifices was essentially true, and capable of the most ethical interpretation. The word *Kipper*, in fact, means to 'wipe so as to make bright or white,' and does not mean to 'cover.'

The Rev. C. F. Burney, D.Litt., Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer of St. John's College, Oxford, to whom I am much indebted for assisting me in the study of Old Testament doctrine, has called my attention to the conclusions of the Rev. C. J. Ball, Lecturer in Assyriology to the University of Oxford. Mr. Ball and Dr. Burney have, after careful examination, assured me that the Assyrian meaning attached to this root is indisputable. The predominating idea as to the result effected by the action involved is purity and brightness. The word is applied to the

[1] See page 62.

whitening or cleansing of wheat meal (Kapâru ša qême), and the cleansing of the righteous (Kuppuru ša išarum). Mr. Ball refers to *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, vol. xii. Plate vi. Here the word Kuppuru occurs in a syllabary which gives the various equivalents of the sun-ideogram. The majority of these equivalents have to do with brightness, such as nûru ša išŝâti, 'light of fire,' namru, 'bright,' ellu, 'bright.' Mr. Ball says that in Sumerian and Assyrian hymns the restoration of the sinner is always expressed under the idea of brightness. In W. Muss-Arnolt, *Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* (Berlin, 1898), part vii. p. 423, *Kaparu* is explained as 'destroy,' 'do away with.' But the idea involves the thought of wiping away; and Dr. Burney has shown me that in the tale of Nerigal and Eriškigal the word is actually used for wiping away a tear: Eberhard Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, Band vi. i. p. 78, fragment ii. line 20 (Berlin, 1901).

The Aramaic and Syriac use is closely similar. It is to 'wipe,' 'wipe away,' or 'wipe off,' as with a sponge, or with the corporal used for wiping the Eucharistic paten: R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, tom. i. p. 1798 (Oxford, 1879). It also had the metaphorical meaning 'deny.' Hence in modern Syriac *kâpir* means to 'deny' or 'renounce'; and a derivative signifies 'self-denial,' with which we may compare the English 'self-effacement': A. J. Maclean, *Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, p. 137 (Oxford, 1901).

Even in Arabic the kindred word *kafara* probably originally meant 'wipe out,' 'obliterate,' and not 'cover.' Lane in his Arabic-English Dictionary, Book i. part vii. p. 2622 (London, 1885), defines *kaffâra* as an action, or a quality, which has the effect of effacing a wrong action or sin or crime. A related word is applied to the darkness of night which obliterates the view. In the Koran the *Kâfir* is an unbeliever, and the lexicographers thought of the unbeliever as a hypocrite who hides his true belief in his heart. But the real meaning is one who refuses to acknowledge God's benefits, and a kindred word is used in Arabic for ingratitude. The *Kâfir* is the ungrateful man who obliterates the impression which God makes upon him, or the signs which God gives him. He disbelieves or denies the truth, not because he hides it, but because he would like to efface it. In Arabic the wind is said to *kafara* a footprint. This may imply covering it. But the wind not only covers it with fresh sand but blows some of the old sand away. It obliterates the footprint, it erases it. Therefore, though the primitive meaning of the word has been weakened in Arabic, it is not totally lost. The notion of wiping away is still there.

It is well worth remarking that the distinguished Semitic scholar, W. Robertson Smith, in his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 381 (second edition), after mentioning that Wellhausen had very ingeniously worked out the various Hebrew usages, starting from the sense 'cover,' adds, 'but it seems to me that his argument might be easily accommodated to the other possible etymology' (*i.e.* 'wipe out' or 'wipe clean'). See also Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 497, columns 1 and 2 (Oxford, 1892).

Mr. Ball further points out that the idea of 'brightness' explains the hitherto unexplained etymology of the Hebrew word for hoar-frost, *kĕphōr*. This word is now seen to keep close to the primitive significance of the root. And when we find that the oldest known forms of the word (Assyrian) have certain meanings, and that in the later and kindred languages a group of words bears meanings which can be explained as derived from this original idea of wiping so as to make white or bright, and that they cannot be explained on the other hypothesis, the conclusion is fairly certain.

Everything points to the fact that in Hebrew *Kipper* originally meant (i) to wipe out or wipe away, and (ii) to purify. And in the Old Testament it means (i) to wipe away by some act of reparation or gift of compensation, and (ii) to purify ceremonially or spiritually.

INDEX

Abarbanel, on Servant of the Lord, 168.
Abraham, justified by faith, 182, 198.
Acts of the Apostles, critical views of, 159; discourses of, 162.
Adam, in Genesis, 15; in teaching of S. Paul, 193, 203; the 'second Adam,' 203.
Altar, the Christian, 239.
Angels, mediation of, 217.
Anselm, S., on Atonement, 103.
Apocalypse. *See* Revelation.
Ascension of Christ, in S. John, 134; in Acts, 163; in Hebrews, 236.
Asceticism, S. Paul's attitude towards, 218.
Atone, the meaning of the word, 66, 255.
Atonement, Day of, 78, 242.
Augustine, S., 4, 6, 12.
'Azazel, 79.

Ball, C. J., 255.
Baptism, of Christ, 97; in the Gospels, 120, 133; in Acts, 170; in 1 S. Peter, 175, 179; in S. Paul, 204; in Hebrews, 232.
Batiffol, P., 137.
Baur, F. C., on early Christianity, 59, 185.
Beast, in Revelation, 153, 156.
Birth, or Begetting, from God, 52.
Blood, in Old Testament, sacrificial use of, 74, 80; sacramental meaning of, 82; in our Lord's teaching, 110, 132; in subsequent apostolic teaching, 143, 154, 169, 179, 200, 232, 236.
Bread of life, 131.
Buddhism, on sin, 1; on redemption, 26; on patience, 128.
Burney, C. F., 255.
Burnt-offering, 74, 76, 199.

Calvin, on substitution, 115.
Calvinism, reaction from, 212.
Celsus, heathen philosopher, 218.
Church, S. Paul's doctrine of, 219.
Clement of Rome, S., quotes Hebrews, 222.
'Commercial theory' of Atonement, 104.
Communion, as part of propitiation, 80, 106, 134, 136, 204, 244.
Confession of sin, in Judaism, 84; to S. John Baptist, 97.
Conscience, in Hebrews, 232.
Covenant, Old and New, in Synoptists, 110; in 1 S. Peter, 176; in Hebrews, 229.
Crucifixes, earlier type of, 129.
Cur Deus Homo, 104, 228.
Curse, Christ becoming, 209.

Dante, *Divina Commedia* of, 117, 149.
Death, Hebrew conception of, 18, 193.
Death of Christ, significance of, in Synoptic Gospels, 95; in S. John's writings, 126; in early apostolic teaching, 165; in S. Paul, 197; in Hebrews, 228, 231; in what sense a substitution, 102, 111, 205, 231; in what sense representative, 203, 211, 231; summary of New Testament teaching concerning, 252.

Dedication, in Hebrews, 234.
Depravity, total, 4.
Desolation of Christ, 115, 208.
Divinity of Christ, 36, 112, 125, 150, 164, 197, 217.
Driver, S. R., on Isaiah liii., 168.
Duns Scotus, 146.

Edwards, Jonathan, on Christ bearing God's wrath, 212.
Eleusinian mysteries, 106.
Emperors, Roman, worship of, 153, 156.
Eucharist, 106, 130.
Eucharistic sacrifice, its relation to Christ's work in heaven, 245.

Faith, in Synoptists, 45; in S. John, 131; in Acts, 170; in 1 S. Peter, 175; in S. James, 183; in S. Paul, 191, 202, 214.
Fall, the, in Genesis, 14, 91; in S. Paul, 193, 203.
Fatherhood of God, 22, 53, 125, 197, 253.
Fathers of the Church, on Atonement, 103.
Flesh, in teaching of S. John, 132; in teaching of S. Paul, 205.

Galen, on Christian morals, 33.
Gangra, Council of, 4.
Gentiles, their right to the Gospel, 40, 121, 158.
Gibeonites, David and, 68.
Gnosticism, on death of Christ, 115; on the Old Testament, 249.
God, doctrine of, 11, 22, 45, 52, 141.
Gore, Bishop, on the ministry, 152.
Gospels, date and sources of, 38, 50.
Grace of God, 140, 196.
Guilt-offering, 72, 74, 77.

Harnack, A., on the nature of the Gospel, 60.
Hebrews, the Epistle to the, critical questions relating to, 222; theology of, 224.
Hegesippus, 182.
Hermas, 'Shepherd' of, 243.
'High places,' 81.
Holy Spirit, work of, 25; in S. John, 139, 143; in early apostolic teaching, 164, 170, 175, 180.

Ignatius, S., 130.
Immaculate conception of Blessed Virgin, 119.
Immanuel, prophecy of, 166.
Imputation of guilt, 19; of Christ's obedience, 198.
Incarnation, fact of, 31, 50, 93, 141, 198, 225; whether independent of the fall, 248.
Irenaeus, S., 79, 249.

James, S., the Epistle of, 159, 180; doctrinal contents of, 182; his personal relation to S. Paul, 187.
Jerusalem, Council at, 159; worship centralised at, 250.
Jesus Christ, His attitude towards the Law, 49, 90; His doctrine of sin, 24; His testimony to Himself, 43, 46, 53; His predictions of His death, 99, 127; His resurrection, 118; as the incarnate Logos, 54, 141; as the Servant of Jehovah, 72, 98, 165; doctrine of His Person, in Acts, 162; in S. Peter, 177; in S. James, 186; in S. Paul, 197, 217; in Hebrews, 224.
Jewish doctrine, of sin, 18; of repentance, 84.
John, S., Gospel of, 50, 123; First Epistle of, 142; Revelation of, 148.
John of Damascus, S., 103.
Joses, the Galilean, rabbi, 166.
Jude, S., Epistle of, 159, 180.
Judgment, return of Christ for, 47.
Jülicher, A., his Introduction to New Testament, 180.
Justification, in S. James, 183; in S. Paul, 200, 215.
Justin Martyr, S., 166, 249.

Kingdom of God, Jewish doctrine of, 43; Christ's doctrine of, 44.
Kipper, meaning of, 62, 66, 255.
Kephor, hoar-frost, 257.
Kopher, ransom, 64.

Lamb of God, 152, 163.
Law, the Jewish, purpose of, 87, 250; attitude of Christ towards, 90; of Jewish Christians, 158;

of S. James, 181; of S. Paul, 191, 215.
Laying on of hands, sacrificial, 75, 76; significance of, 78.
Levitical sacrifices, 73, 226, 250.
Life, eternal, in S. John, 52, 125.
Light, in S. John, 52, 142.
Lightfoot, Bishop, on Acts, 161.
Liturgy of S. James, 243; of S. John Chrysostom, 243.
Logos, doctrine of, in S. John, 54, 141; in the apologists, 57; parallels to, 55, 217.
Lord's Supper, in the Synoptists, 106; in S. John, 133, 143; in Hebrews and S. Paul, 244.
Lourdes, alleged apparitions at, 119.
Love, in teaching of S. John, 126, 145, 151; of S. Paul, 191, 213.
Luke, S., Gospel of, 42; author of Acts, 160.
Luther, 180, 185.

Mark, S., Gospel of, 42.
Mass, Roman canon of, 243.
Matthew, S., Gospel of, 42.
Mediator, Christ as, in S. John, 52, 125; in S. Paul, 197, 217; in Hebrews, 224; *passim*.
Melchizedek, priesthood of, 226, 237.
Messiah, our Lord as, 46, 162; Jewish doctrine of, 48, 167.
Michelangelo, 10.
Ministry, in S. Paul, 220.
Morality, Christ's teaching on, 24, 32, 44; early Christian, 33; S. Peter on, 179; S. James on, 186; S. Paul on, 189, 215.
Mosheh Kohen Ibn Crispin, 168.
Moslems, sacrifices of, 81; their theory of Christ's death, 115.
Muhammad, origin of his religion, 157.

Name of Jesus, festival of, 147.
Natural, how far sin is, 5.
Nero, in the Apocalypse, 148; his persecution, 155, 176, 189.
Newman, J. H., his Essay on Development, 249.
Nirvana, 3.

'Objective' doctrine of Atonement, 230.
Old Testament doctrine of Atonement, 61.
Oriental heresy as to Christ's death, 115; as to asceticism, 218.
Origen, his theory of Atonement, 103.

Papias, on the origin of the Gospels, 42.
Paraclete, or Advocate, 139.
Paul, S., authenticity of his Epistles, 34; his doctrine of the Person of Christ, 197, 217; his religious history, 188; his doctrine of the Law, 191, 210, 215; his view of Adam and the race, 192, 203; his doctrine of sin, 192; his doctrine of Christ's death, 197; his doctrine of Christ's resurrection, 203; on justification, 200, 215; on asceticism, 218; on the Church, 219; on the Lord's table, 244.
Peace-offering, 74, 75.
Penal theory of Old Testament sacrifices, 73; of the death of Christ, 205; nature of man's suffering, 193, 209.
Philo, his doctrine of the Logos, 56.
Possession, demoniacal, in Gospels, 41.
Pre-existence of Christ, 52, 55, 127, 217, 224.
Priesthood of Christ, 138, 177, 226, 237; of all Christian people, 152.
Priestly Code in Old Testament, 65.
Prodigal Son, parable of, 28, 95.
Prophetic doctrine of salvation, 87.
Propitiation, 63, 67, 144, 200.
Punishment, in what sense Christ endured, 202.

Quenstedt, on Atonement, 115.

Rahab, 183.
Ransom, idea of, in Old Testament, 64; in Christ's teaching, 101; in Revelation, 154; *passim*.
Reconciliation, S. Paul's doctrine of, 197, 202.
Redemption, 103, 179, 209, 233.
Remission of sins, 106, 118, 172.

Renan, on Servant of the Lord, 166.
Repentance, in apostolic teaching, 169; in Hebrews, 232.
Resurrection, in Gospels, 118, 131; in Acts, 163; in 1 S. Peter, 179; in S. Paul, 203; in Hebrews, 237.
Revelation, Book of, 148.
Righteousness, 189, 207.
Robinson, J. Armitage, on baptism, 170.

Sacrifices, Levitical, described, 73.
Salvation Army, 140.
Sanctification, Christ's, of Himself, 138, 234; of the Christian, 139, 233.
Satan, theory of ransom paid to, 103.
Satisfaction, theories of, 104, 146; of God in Christ's service, 106, 200, 253.
Selfishness as the root of sin, 25.
Servant of the Lord, in Isaiah, 72; Christ as, 111, 162, 165.
Shame, vicarious, 116.
Sin, 1; *passim*; Christ as, 206.
Sin-offering, in Old Testament, 74, 76; Christ as, 178, 241.
'Son of God,' title, in Synoptic Gospels, 48.
'Son of Man,' title, 47.
Spirit, as the second Person of the Trinity, 135, 227.
Substitution of Christ for sinners, 93, 111, 231.
Suffering, vicarious, 102, 168, 179, 209, 225.

Temptation necessary to moral progress, 16.
Temptation of Christ, 98, 238.
Tertullian, on 'satisfaction,' 104.
Thanksgiving, sacrifice of, 75.
Thomas, S., the apostle, 28.
Thomas à Kempis, 147.
Thomas Aquinas, S., on confessing the sin of others, 116; on the Christian altar, 241.
Trinity, the doctrine implied in S. John, 141; in early apostolic teaching, 170, 175, 180.

Union of the Christian with Christ, in S. John, 139; in S. Paul, 203; in Hebrews, 239.
Unitarianism, 57, 141.

Vespasian, 148.
Vicarious punishment, 93, 202; shame, 116; suffering, 102, 168, 179, 209, 225.

Wernle, P., his theory that S. Paul originated the doctrine of the Atonement, 60.
Westminster Confession, on man's total depravity, 4; on the imputed obedience of Christ, 198.
Wilfrid, S., 5.
Works, doctrine of, essentially the same in S. James and S. Paul, 183, 185.
Worship, nature of Christian, 235.
Wrath of God, ethical, 192; how far borne by Christ, 212.

Zwingli, his doctrine of the Eucharist, 136.

Printed by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty at the Edinburgh University Press

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

Edited by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's; and the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

Price 5s. each volume.

RELIGION. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'*The Oxford Library of Practical Theology* makes a good beginning with Canon Newbolt's volume on religion. . . . The publishers have spared no pains in making the appearance of the volumes as attractive as possible. The binding, type, and general "get up" of the volume just issued leave nothing to be desired.'—*Guardian.*

HOLY BAPTISM. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'Few books on Baptism contain more thoughtful and useful instruction on the rite, and we give Mr. Stone's effort our highest approval. It might well be made a text-book for candidates for the diaconate, or at least in theological colleges. As a book for thoughtful laymen it is also certain to find a place.'—*Church Times.*

CONFIRMATION. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

'To the parochial clergy this volume may be warmly commended. They will find it to be a storehouse of material for their instruction, and quite the best treatise that we have on the subject it treats. It is thoroughly practical, and gives exactly the kind of teaching that is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

'Mr. Pullan's book will no doubt have, as it deserves to have, a large number of readers, and they will gain a great deal from the perusal of it. It may be certainly recommended to the ordinary layman as by far the best book on the subject available.'—*Pilot.*

HOLY MATRIMONY. By the Rev. W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

'Canon Knox Little has given us a most exhaustive treatise on Holy Matrimony written in his best and happiest style, and giving ample proofs of wide research and deep study of the various aspects, and the essential characteristics of Christian marriage. . . . We would strongly advise the clergy to place this work upon their shelves as a book of reference, while it forms a complete manual of instruction to aid them in the preparation of addresses on the subject.'—*Church Bells.*

THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. H. V. S. ECK, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

'The teaching is sound, and the book may be placed with confidence in the hands of candidates for Orders or of intelligent and educated lay people who desire fuller instruction on the central doctrines of the Faith than can be provided in sermons.'—*Guardian.*

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. E. T. CHURTON, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nassau.

'We welcome Bishop Churton's book as an authoritative exposition of the modern High Church view of Missions. It is good for us all to understand it, thereby we shall be saved alike from uninstructed admiration and indiscriminate denunciation.'—*Church Missionary Intelligencer.*

PRAYER. By the Rev. ARTHUR JOHN WORLLEDGE, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro.

'We do not know of any book about prayer which is equally useful; and we anticipate that it will be a standard work for, at any rate, a considerable time.'—*Pilot.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

SUNDAY. By the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Westminster.

'An extremely useful contribution to a difficult and important subject, and we are confident it will rank high in the series to which it belongs.'—*Guardian.*

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

*** *This book contains an account of the origin of Episcopacy, the three Creeds, the Ancient Western Liturgies and other institutions of the Church. Special attention is also given to the early history of Sacramental Confession and to the principle of Authority in the Church of England.*

BOOKS OF DEVOTION. By the Rev. Charles Bodington, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield.

'Extremely valuable for its high tone, fidelity to Catholic standards, and powerful advocacy of reality in private devotion. To those who have never studied the subject, it should reveal a mine of devotional wealth yet to be worked with profit to man and glory to God.'—*Church Times.*

HOLY ORDERS. By the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham College, Abingdon.

'For the educated layman who wishes to know what the Church is teaching about the ministry, and what the relation of the laity to it really is, this is the best book with which we have met.'—*Pilot.*

THE CHURCH CATECHISM THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'We think the book should be in the possession of every teacher who can afford it, and in every Church Library for the benefit of those who cannot.'—*Reader and Layworker.*

THE HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'The book meets a distinct want, and is indispensable to all who desire to have a concise and well-balanced summary of the different opinions which have been held with regard to the Holy Communion from the earliest days of the Church.'—*Oxford Diocesan Magazine.*

CHURCH WORK. By the Rev. Bernard Reynolds, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's.

'What is needed is a brightly written and sensible book which will suggest topics for consideration and the way in which a Christian should view them. The book before us fulfils these conditions. It is stimulating and suggestive, and that is exactly what is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. W. H. Abraham, D.D., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Hull.

'It is exactly the kind of work upon the subject which has long been needed—full, reliable, and sound.'—*Church Times.*

OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, M.A., of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By the Rev. Walter Howard Frere, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection.

THE ATONEMENT. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

Handbooks for the Clergy

EDITED BY THE

REV. ARTHUR W. ROBINSON, B.D.

VICAR OF ALLHALLOWS BARKING BY THE TOWER

Crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d. net each volume.

THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE CLERGY. By the EDITOR.

'It is a short book, but it covers a wide field. Every line of it tells, and it is excellent reading. Not the least valuable part of the book are the extremely apt and striking quotations from various writers of eminence, which are placed in the form of notes at the end of the chapters. It is emphatically a book for both clergy and laity to buy and study.'—*Church Times.*

'We are grateful for a little book which will be of service to many priests, young and old. We need more priests, and such a book may well increase their number by explaining the nature of the life to which a vocation to Holy Orders calls men: but we need still more that priests should realize the life to which they are called and pledged; and this they can hardly fail to do if they listen to Mr. Robinson's prudent and tender counsels.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

PATRISTIC STUDY. By the Rev. H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

'The whole of the work which this little volume contains is most admirably done. Sufficient is told about the personal history of the Fathers to make the study of their writings profitable.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

'This is an admirable little guide-book to wide study by one who well knows how to guide. It is sound and learned, and crammed full of information, yet pleasant in style and easy to understand.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

THE MINISTRY OF CONVERSION. By the Rev. A. J. MASON, D.D., Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury.

'It will be found most valuable and interesting.'—*Guardian.*

'Canon Mason has given a manual that should be carefully studied by all, whether clergy or laity, or have in any way to share in the "Ministry of Conversion" by preaching, by parochial organisation, or by personal influence.'—*Scottish Guardian.*

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Tasmania, Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

'Bishop Montgomery's admirable little book. . . . Into a limited compass he has compressed the very kind of information which gives one an adequate impression of the spirit which pervades a religion, of what is its strength and weakness, what its relation to Christianity, what the side upon which it must be approached.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS. By the Very Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

'Nothing could be more desirable than that the Anglican clergy should be equipped with knowledge of the kind to which this little volume will introduce them, and should regard the questions with which Biblical study abounds in the candid spirit, and with the breadth of view which they see here exemplified.'—*Spectator.*

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC. By the Very Rev. WILFORD L. ROBBINS, Dean of the General Theological Seminary, New York.

'We commend this handbook with confidence as a helpful guide to those clergy and teachers who have thoughtful doubters to deal with, and who wish to build safely if they build at all.'—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

PASTORAL VISITATION. By the Rev. H. E. Savage, M.A., Vicar of Halifax, and Hon. Canon of Durham.

'This is an excellent book.'—*Spectator.*

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. By the Very Rev. T. B. Strong, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

'This is a valuable and timely book, small in bulk, but weighty both in style and substance.'—*Guardian.*

THE STUDY OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. By the Right Rev. W. E. Collins, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar.

'A book which displays the master-mind on every page, and has what many master-minds lack, a sober, practical, common-sense strain about it, which is hardly ever found in those who set out to instruct us in Church History, or Canon Law, or Catholic use.'—*Church Bells.*

LAY WORK AND THE OFFICE OF READER. By the Right Rev. Huyshe Yeatman-Biggs, D.D., Bishop of Worcester.

'A wise and valuable little book. Bishop Yeatman-Biggs knows what he is writing about; he has packed into a small space all that most people could desire to learn; and he has treated it with sense and soberness, though never with dulness.'—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By the Rev. P. N. Waggett, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.

'The main result of this remarkable book is to present the clergy, for whom it is intended primarily (but we hope by no means entirely, for it should appeal even more forcibly to the other camp, to the professors than to the preachers), with a point of view.'—*Church Times.*

CHURCH MUSIC. By A. Madeley Richardson, Mus. Doc., Organist of Southwark Cathedral.

'Probably scarcely a clergyman in the country would fail to benefit by Dr. Richardson's fifth and sixth chapters on the clergyman's part of the church services. Throughout the little book its earnestness and its thoughtfulness for the reader command respect.'—*Record.*

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. By the Ven. Archdeacon Foxley Norris, M.A., Rector of Barnsley, and Hon. Canon of Wakefield.

'Every young clergyman should master the contents of this handbook.'—*Carlisle Diocesan Gazette.*

CHARITABLE RELIEF. By the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A.

'This practical and suggestive manual should be earnestly commended to the parochial clergy. It is written clearly and concisely, and with a thorough grasp of the subject.'—*Guardian.*

INTEMPERANCE. By the Right Rev. H. H. Pereira, D.D., Bishop of Croydon.

'The methods for working reform suggested by Dr. Pereira are eminently practical. He points out what can be done by Acts of Parliament, but makes it plain that the heart of the evil can only be reached by personal effort on the part of the clergy.'—*Guardian.*

THE LEGAL POSITION OF THE CLERGY. By Philip Vernon Smith, M.A., LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.

'It will be found a most useful book for reference on the many questions which are continually arising in connexion with the duties of the clergy and their legal position.'—*Church Family Newspaper.*

PREPARATION FOR CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. J. P. Maud, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

41795 232.3Q P96 c.1

Pullon, Leighton

AUTHOR

The Atomement

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
NOV 18 '75	R. Page	DEC 4 '75

232.3 Q
P96
c.1

41795